

PE
225
M42





Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924027343304>

Cornell University Library
PE 225.M42

Conditional sentence in Anglo-Saxon.



3 1924 027 343 304

olin

THE
CONDITIONAL SENTENCE
IN
ANGLO-SAXON

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED
TO THE
BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY BALTIMORE
FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
BY
FRANK JEWETT MATHER JR.

MUNICH 1893.
PRINTED BY DR. C. WOLF & SOHN.

PREFACE.

The following investigation is an attempt to write that chapter of Anglo-Saxon syntax which relates to the conditional sentence, by explaining so far as possible the nature, and by exhibiting all the varieties, of that construction.

With this end in view the writer has stated his conclusions in connected form with only examples enough to illustrate the different points.

But an investigator is bound to present enough of his processes and material, first to give the reader control of the work and second to facilitate further investigation in the same field. It is hoped that these ends have been attained by the somewhat minute division of the subject, and by the appended statistics. Thus a body of material is offered sufficiently large to relieve the future writer of an Anglo-Saxon syntax of the drudgery of collecting examples for this branch of his subject.

In any such work the Latin originals must be taken constantly into account, if only to free one's self of the idea, which still has some currency, that all Anglo-Saxon prose is Latinized. The writer's collations which are as complete as possible have been presented in the comparatively few cases in which they appeared to have especial interest or value. The debased nature of most of the Latin which was translated into Anglo-Saxon makes it impossible in great measure to make the categories of classical Latin grammar the point of de-

parture or of contrast for the syntactical study of Anglo-Saxon prose, even if this procedure were desirable. Outside of a certain few texts it is quite impossible to prove any farreaching influence of Latin upon Anglo-Saxon. The many coincidences we should expect of course prove nothing. The language must be studied upon the basis of an unbiased survey of its own phenomena, not, as too often in the past, with the intention of making it square to the rules of Latin grammar. There are certain, frequent variations from the Latin which are instructive for the determination of the value of moods in Anglo-Saxon. These are cited in the course of the dissertation.

From his experience with syntactical dissertations the writer believes that we shall better attain a scientific syntax of Anglo-Saxon, by the study of single constructions in all the important monuments, than by complete studies of the syntax of isolated texts, however conscientious and painstaking. The many ambiguous forms in the Anglo-Saxon will invariably lead astray the investigator who cannot check his work by a great number of examples.

The bibliography will show how far the writer has depended upon his own reading and to what extent he has availed himself of previous syntactical investigations. Such previous work is often silently supplemented by the writer's own reading.

The obligations of a worker in the field of syntax to the standard works on that subject are so obvious as hardly to call for mention. In the absence of any really authoritative work on Anglo-Saxon syntax or even of any ancient Germanic language as a whole, the writer has been driven to the more general portions of those grammars and syntactical studies of the classical languages, which contain sounder

and broader work than has yet been produced in the newer field of Germanic syntax. Such a debt is wholly an indirect one and one that can hardly be expressed by page and paragraph; for one cannot apply classical categories directly to Anglo-Saxon, the mood-system for instance differs essentially from that of Latin and of Greek; but the debt in none the less a real one.

The writer is conscious of no far-reaching obligations to the authorities cited, except to Prof. Goodwin's article on the conditional sentence in Greek, and to the same writer's "Moods and Tenses", which did much to emancipate him from the conventional view of the subjunctive, and to the article by Dr. Erbe which offered a classification of the subject which the writer has followed in principle if not in all details. The statistical dissertations of Drs. Fleischhauer and Wohlfahrt are particularly valuable for an abundant material carefully and conveniently arranged. The writer is glad to acknowledge an obligation of a more personal nature to Dr. Bright of this university, to whom he owes, at least in part, the suggestion of the subject of this dissertation, encouragement and advice during its preparation, and the training which alone could give it any value.

If the publication of this work marks a permanent advance however small towards that *desideratum* a complete and thorough syntax of Anglo-Saxon, the writer will feel rewarded for the time and energy expended upon it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following works have been read entire. The references are to page and line unless otherwise specified. For the poetry the references are to the lines. All non-poetical biblical texts are cited by chapter and verse. With a few exceptions the references are not to the protasis but to the point necessary to establish the context of the sentence.

- O. E. T. The Oldest English Texts. E. E. T. S. No. 83. Ed. Henry Sweet. 1885.
- C. P. King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care. E. E. T. S. Nos. 45 & 50. Ed. Henry Sweet. 1871-2.
- Or. King Alfred's Orosius. E. E. T. S. No. 79. Ed. Henry Sweet. 1883.
- Cons.*) King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon Version of Boethius de Consolatione Philosophiæ etc. Ed. Samuel Fox. (Bohn's Antiquarian Library) London 1864.
- Beda. The Old English Version of Beda's Ecclesiastical History of the English People. E. E. T. S. No. 95. Ed. Thomas Miller. 1890—1.
- Chron.***) 'Parker Ms'; Chron. E 'Laud ms'. Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel. Ed. John Earle. Oxford 1865.

*) Since this antiquated edition must soon be superseded it has not seemed worth while to number the lines. The references are to the pages and to the general position on the page: h, 'high'; m, 'middle'; and l, 'low'. Forms of especial interest are cited in addition by chapter and by paragraph, so that they may be found without great difficulty in a subsequent edition.

**) Citations from the shorter paragraphs are given by the year, from long passages by page and position (h, m, l).

- Mat., Mk., Lk., Jn., for the Cott. ms. R & L is appended to designate the Rushworth and Lindisfarne glosses respectively. The Gospels in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions. Eds. Skeat, Kemble, and Hardwick (Cambridge University Press.) 1858—78.
- Blick. The Blickling Homilies. E. E. T. S. 58, 63, 73 Ed. Richard Morris. 1874, 6, 80.
- Hom. The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. 2 vols. Ed. Benjamin Thorpe, for the Aelfric Soc. London 1844, 6.
- Wulf. Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien. Ed. Arthur Napier. Berlin 1883.
- Rid. The Riddles of the Exeter Book in Grein's Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie.
The following dissertations*) have been of assistance in the gathering of Material.
- Andr. Untersuchung über die Syntax in dem Angelsächsischen Gedichte vom Andreas. A. Reussner. Leipz., Diss. 1889.
- Beo. Zur Syntax des Beowulf. E. Nader. Anglia VIII.
- Cr. Der Syntaktische Gebrauch des Verbuns in dem angelsächsischen Gedichte "Christ". B. Hertel. Leipzig, Diss. 1891.
- Dom. Die Syntaktischen Erscheinungen in Be Domes Dæge. J. Höser. Halle, 1889.
- Cad. Ex. Darstellung der Syntax in der sogenannten Cadmonischen Exodus. E. A. Kempf. Halle, 1888.
- El. Darstellung der Syntax in Cynewulfs Elene. J. Schür-

*) References to the poetry are to the line numbering of Grein's 'Bibliothek', with the exception of those for Beowulf which are to the revision of Heyne's 4th edition Edited by Harrison and Sharp for the Library of Anglo-Saxon Poetry. 3rd ed. Boston 1888. All citations are made in the now universally accepted orthography.

mann (Körtings neuphilologische Studien 4. Heft).
Paderborn 1884.

Cæd. Gen. Der Syntaktische Gebrauch des Verbums in dem
Cædmon beigelegten angelsächsischen Gedicht von der
Genesis. H. Seyfarth. Leipzig. Diss. 1891.

Guth. Der Syntaktische Gebrauch des Verbums in dem
angelsächsischen Gedicht vom heiligen Guthlac. Leip-
zig, Diss. 1889.

Aelfr. T., Gen., Ex., Lev., Num., Dent., Job. Die Syntax
des Verbums in Aelfrics Übersetzung des Heptateuch
und des Buches Hiob. H. Wohlfahrt. Leipzig, Diss.,
1885 (Aelfr. T. designates the introduction).

Jul. Darstellung der Syntax in Cynewulf's Gedicht Juliana.
C. P. B. Conradi. Leipzig. Diss., 1886.

Phoen. Über den Syntaktischen Gebrauch des Verbums in
in dem angelsächsischen Gedicht vom Phoenix.
J. Plauer. Leipzig. Diss. 1891.

Saints. Syntax des Verbums in Aelfric's Heiligen Leben.
Kuhn. Leipzig. Diss. 1889.

Studien zur Aelfricschen Syntax. B. Schrader.
Göttingen, Diss. 1837.

Syntax der Blickling Homilies. J. Flamme. Bonn.
Diss., 1885.

Über den Gebrauch des Conjunctivs in Alfreds altenglischer
Übersetzung von Gregors Cura Pastoralis. Wm. Fleisch-
hauer. Erlangen, 1885.

Darstellung der Syntax in den vier Echten Predigten des
Angelsächsischen Erzbischofs Wulfstan. A. Mohrbutter.
Münster. Diss., 1885.

Über den syntaktischen Gebrauch des Conjunctivs in den
Cynewulfischen Dichtungen Elene, Juliana und Crist.
M. Prollius. Marburg. Diss., 1888.

Other works consulted:

- Mätzner, E.: Englische Grammatik. 2. Aufl. II & III, Berlin 1874.
- Koch: Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache. 2. Aufl. II. Cassel 1878.
- March. F. A.: A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language. New-York 1871.
- Hotz G.: On the Use of the Subjunctive Mood in Anglo-Saxon and its further History in Old English. Zürich, Diss., 1882.
- Erdmann. Untersuchung über die syntax der sprache Olfrieds. Halle 1874.
- Kühner, R.: Ausführliche Grammatik der Græcischen Sprache. 2. Aufl. Hannover 1869—72.
- Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache. 2. Aufl. Hannover 1877—9.
- Goodwin W.: Journal of Philology V 186—205 and Trans. Amer. Philol. Soc. 1873 p. 60—79.
- Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. Boston 1890.
- Gildersleeve B. L.: 1) On εἰ with the Future Indicative and εἰς with the Subjunctive in the Tragic Poets. Transactions of the American Philological Society 1876, p. 5—8, and 2) A Latin Grammar New-York 1885.
- Erbe M.: Über die Conditionalsätze bei Wolfram von Eschenbach. P. B. B. V, 1—50.
- Lüttgens C.: Über Bedeutung und Gebrauch der Hilfsverba in Frühem Altenglischen. Sculan and Willan, Kiel. Diss., 1888.
-

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	pp.
Introduction and bibliography	III—IX
SECTION I.	
The conditional construction in general and in Anglo-Saxon .	1—3
SECTION II.	
Mood and Tense.	
1. Ambiguous forms	4
2. Subjunctive and Indicative	5—6
3. Theories of the subj. in A.-S. (Koch, March, Mätzner)	6—7
4. The Pres. Subj. in protasis.	
A. In the protasis to a command or wish	9—12
B. In a protasis introduced by buton	13—14
5. The indicative	15
6. The pret. subj.	
A. Unfulfilled	16
B. Ideal condition	16
Note. Form of the weak pret in L. W.-S.	16—18
7. Tabular conspectus of moods and tenses in prot. and in apod.	18—20
SECTION III.	
Formal conditions without conditional significance: 1. Indirect questions. 2. Concessive conditions. 3. Optative conditions.	
4. Forms of address	21—23
SECTION IV.	
General classification of conditional sentences	24

XII

CLASS I. The simple or logical condition.	pp.
A) In pres. or fut. time with pres. indic.	
1. The apod. is a simple statement	25
Remarks. Formation of the prot. without gif:	
1. Inversion. 2. imperative condition. 3. periphrastical condition	25—27
2. The apod. is an exclamation or a question	27—29
B) The logical cond. in past time. Pret. indic. in Prot.	
1. Apod. with pret. indic.	29
2. Apod. with pres. indic.	29
Remarks inversion and periphrastical condition	30
CLASS II. Condit. with mandatory apodoses. Pres subj.	
in prot.	30
A. The apod. is a command wish or exhortation.	
1. Imperative in apod.	31
Note. Pres. indic. in protases of such conditions	31
2. Apod. with the subj. (adhortative)	31
Note. Indic. in prot. of this condition.	32
B) The apod. expresses a moral obligation	32
Note. Indic. in prot.	33
CLASS III. The ideal condition.	
Pret. subjs. in both clauses	33
Appendix: The pres. subj. in prot., neither introduced by buton nor induced by a mandatory apod.	
1. Formulas of address	34
2. Guarded statement	35
3. Ideas of doubt etc.	36
4. Miscellaneous instances	37—38
CLASS IV. The unfulfilled Condition.	
A) In past time	39
B) In pres. or fut. time	40
Notes: 1. Inversion. 2. Pær as the conditional conj. 3. Indics. in the unfulfilled condition	40—41
CLASS V. Conditions introduced by buton (nemne, nymde).	
A) The prot. is truly exceptive	41
B) States an indispensable condition	42

Remarks. 1. Buton with indic. etc.	43
2. Expanded forms of the condition	44—45

SECTION V.

The condition expressed by forms usually non-conditional	46
1. Relative conditions	47
2. Temporal conditions	48
a) Introduced by þonne	49
b) Didactic condition with þonne	50
c) with ær	50
d) With mid ðy	50
3. Conditional subject clauses	51
4. Introduced by þær	52
5. Concessive condition	52
6. Modal condition.	
a) Swa 'provided that'	53
b) Swylce 'as if'	53
7. Conditional dative absolute	54
8. Phrase with buton	54
9. Two sentences as members of a conditional period.	55

SECTION VI.

Contracted and Elliptical clauses; Contraction	56
Of buton clauses	56—58
The condition expressing purpose	58
Ellipsis. Formulas of address	59
Clauses introduced by oððe or elles	60
Miscellaneous. A prot. in pres. time with an apod. in past time	61

SECTION VII.

The conditional sentence in indirect discourse and subordinate position	62
A) Dependent upon a verb in present time	63
Indirect discourse.	
a) Pres. indic. in both members	63
b) Pres. subj. in apod.	63
c) Pres. subj. in both clauses	64

	pp.
The apod. is a subject clause. With impersonal constructions.	
a) Indic. in both members	64
b) The subj. in apod.	64
c) Subj. in both members	65
The apod. is a clause of purpose; a consecutive clause	66
B) The conditional sentence dependent upon a verb in the pret.	
1. Indirect discourse.	
a) Pret. subj. in both clauses	67
b) A few pret. indic.	68
The apodosis is dependent upon verbs of commanding; is a subject clause; a clause of purpose	69
SECTION VIII.	
Clause order and word order. Possible arrangements of members: The protasis, precedes, follows, is interpolated	71
Order within the protasis.	
Direct order, when the prot. precedes	72
Transposed order. All but universal when the prot. follows	73
The buton condition.	
Direct and transposed orders	74—75
Inversion	75
Constant principle tending to produce the transposed order	74
Order within the apodosis, usually transposed, induced by	
þonne or ne at the head of the clause	76
Remarks, on unusual orders of the prot.	76—77
SECTION IX.	
Peculiarities of the documents.	
In relation to the Latin	78
nu and þær as conditional conjunctions in Rushworth Matthew	79
Distribution and possible dialectical significance of nemne (nymde)	80
Conditional conjunctions and correlatives	81
STATISTICAL APPENDIX	82—88
Biographical sketch of the author (in conformity with the university regulations).	

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

The writer of this dissertation was born the son of FRANK JEWETT MATHER and CAROLINE GRAVES MATHER at Deep River Connecticut July 6th 1868. His childhood and youth were spent in his father's home at Morristown, New Jersey, where after attending several primary schools he prepared for college at the Morris Academy. In the Fall term of 1885 he entered Williams College; and was graduated from that institution with the degree of A. B. in July 1889. The following Fall he entered Johns Hopkins University and during the past three years has pursued graduate work with English as principal subject and German and History of Philosophy as first and second subordinate subjects respectively. He received the appointment of University Scholar for the session of 1890—91 and that of Fellow for the session of 1891—92. He has taken courses under the following members of the faculty: Drs. Adams, Bright, Browne, Griffin, Learned, Matzke, Todd, and Wood, and Mr. Lewis, to all of whom he owes something for instruction or for inspiration. Especially would he express his deep sense of obligation to Drs. Bright, Griffin and Wood with whom he has found the relation of student and teacher helpful in more than the formal sense.

I.

THE CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION IN GENERAL AND IN ANGLO-SAXON.

The conditional construction is often regarded as a variety of the causal construction. Like the latter it consists of two members: a statement, the apodosis, which is contingent for its validity upon another statement, the protasis. Unlike the causal construction, the validity of the protasis is not, and cannot be, affirmed. The protasis contains only the assumed or suggested ground, the validity of which is to be weighed by the hearer. Thus the whole construction falls into the field of supposition; and when we say that a protasis is 'real' we mean only that it is of a nature to win assent from the hearer. The question of its validity is extragrammatical and logical. The construction can state nothing more than the contingent relation existing between the idea of the apodosis and the idea of the protasis, offering the ideas themselves for judgement.

We have seen that logically the apodosis is dependent upon the protasis, grammatically the relation is reversed. The apodosis is an independent clause while the protasis stands in a dependent and adverbial relation to the verb of the apodosis.

The hypothetical nature of the protasis is usually marked by an introducing conjunction: in Anglo-Saxon generally by the conjunction *gif*.

Though the conditional construction can make no affirmation as to the validity of the ideas presented, it can as to their nature; and we distinguish ordinarily three categories of suppositions: logical, ideal, and unreal, and corresponding to them three great divisions of the conditional sentence.

1. THE LOGICAL CONDITION.

The protasis is objectively real: that is it is to be tested by the standard of fact, and its validity, thus established or disproved. "All that the Logical condition asserts is the inexorable connection of the two members of the sentence" (Gildersleeve I, p. 6).

2. THE IDEAL CONDITION.

The ideas expressed in the two clauses are wholly imaginary, and merely conceived for the sake of argument or illustration. There is no concern as to the objective reality or probability of the ideas, but only as to the validity of the conditional relation between them and the aptness of the ideas for illustration. The condition often contains the expression of something desired.

3. THE UNREAL OR UNFULFILLED CONDITION.

The ideas are presented as contrary to fact or unfulfilled. In this condition the apodosis only is *necessarily* denied. (cf. Moods and Tenses p. 149.)

This division is both logical and convenient for classical Latin; for the three conditions have respectively special grammatical forms: The indic. for 1; the pres. and perf. subj. for 2; and the imp. and plup. subj. for 3.

For Anglo-Saxon the formal divisions do not correspond to the logical. While the great majority of cases under 1 take

the indic., there are also large categories which have the pres. subj. in protasis, (class 2 and class 5 B in the subsequent classification), which appear properly to belong to the logical condition. Then in the main the ideal and the unreal conditions use precisely the same form, the pret. subj., in both clauses, and they are only to be distinguished by context and by function. Accordingly a five fold division suggested by the uses of moods and tenses has been adopted, as much more convenient for study and reference. This division does not clash seriously with these logical categories, while it brings out with appropriate emphasis the forms of the condition which are peculiar to Anglo-Saxon. The consideration of mood and tense in the succeeding section will give the ground-work for the subsequent classification.

II.

MOOD AND TENSE.

1. AMBIGUOUS FORMS.

The investigator of the syntax of the Anglo Saxon verb meets at the outset with the difficulty, that the indic. and subj. forms in several cases coincide. A paradigm will show the increasing confusion of endings from Early, to Late West-Saxon. The later endings are enclosed in brackets.

<i>Pret. Strong.</i>		<i>Pret. Weak.</i>	
Indic.	Subj.	Indic.	Subj.
Sing. 1. healp	hulpe	Sing. 1. hatode	hatode
» 2. hulpe	hulpe	» 2. hatodest	hatode(est)
» 3. healp	hulpe	» 3. hatode	hatode
Plu. 1, 2, 3. hulpon	hulpen(-on)	Plu. 1, 2, 3. hatodon	hatoden(-on)

Thus in Late West-Saxon strong verbs distinguish mood in the pret, only in the 1st. and 3rd sing.; weak verbs only in the 2nd sing. (a distinction which is lost in the later language cf. p. 16) Pret. pres. verbs naturally show the ambiguity respectively in the strong and in the weak pret. The confusion of pret. plu. endings begins even in the Orosius and Pastoral Care. It is evident that the functions of the moods of the pret. are best to be distinguished in the Early West-Saxon texts.

The present tense with the single ambiguity of the 1st. sing. offers no difficulty of this sort.

A second difficulty is that of determining the exact significance of those verbs, such as *sculan* and *willan*, which are moving towards an auxiliary and modal significance. I find instances where their modal significance is unquestionable, but in general agree with Lüttgens that they retain their independent value ever in Late West-Saxon.

I shall proceed immediately to the consideration of the pres. subj.; for this is the only point at which there is likely to be serious difference of opinion; and if I can clear it up, or at least state the reasons for my belief, the remaining cases may be treated with greater brevity.

2. SUBJUNCTIVE AND INDICATIVE.

All grammarians are essentially agreed as tho the great line of division between the indic. and the subj; and the distinction may be stated as follows:

The indic. makes a statement with as little color as possible. The speaker acts simply as a reporter of his thought or observation and expresses no particular relation of his own to the thought beyond that of reporter — preserves as objective an attitude as possible.

The subj. expresses the entrance of a more subjective element, a more intimate relation of the speaker to the thought: 1) He may express with various degrees of intensity a personal interest in the statement as favorable or unfavorable to, wished or demanded by, himself; in which case we have, an optative or adhortative use of the subj. or, 2) He may imply an intellectual judgement upon the intrinsic value of the statement, in its relation to fact, or to probability; or he may wish to imply a restriction or definition of the limits and application of the statement.

All these uses may be included under the potential subj.

In the optative use of the subj. he adds something to the absolute statement, in the potential use he reserves something from it.

We must also recognize the fact that the subj. may be used in many cases formally rather than logically to mark a subordinate relation. Such uses are possibly always referable to original, logical constructions, but as we actually find them in the different languages it is often impossible to class them under any one logical principle, as optative or potential.

The standard views of the pres. subj. in protasis in Anglo-Saxon must be stated, before proceeding to my own consideration of the subject.

3. THEORIES OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN ANGLO-SAXON.

It is generally conceded for Latin and for Germanics that the snbj. in a condition falls under the potential use. Trouble begins at this point, and chiefly in connection with the pres. subj. in protasis. Still practically our only authorities in the Anglo-Saxon field agree in stating that the pres. subj. expresses the condition as only assumed or hypothetical. Koch II. p. 48 under the head of the conditional sentence states: The subj. is used "*in den Sätzen, die eine nur angenommene Bedingung enthalten*". I take it that Professor March means the same thing in his statement Gram. p. 194: "The subjunctive is used in a protasis when proposed as possible, the imperfect when assumed as unreal (so in Latin and Greek)" though I confess that neither the definition itself nor the parenthetical gloss is entirely clear to me. It is evident that a rule so expressed can only be interpreted in its context. Independent citation shows little but lack of definition. The context and the references to the grammars (Hadley for Greek) make it fair however to assume that Professor March

means to state with Koch that the purely hypothetical or ideal condition takes the pres. subj. This view of Koch and of March has been accepted by the great majority of writers upon Anglo-Saxon syntax. My own study forces me to believe that this view of the Anglo-Saxon subj. has been set forth by those whose eye was less on the object than on the Latin grammar.

Mätzner makes no statement for Anglo-Saxon. His statement for English generally is quite as general as and more diplomatically guarded than that of Professor March, a model of cautious if not of accurate statement. "Moods and Tenses p. 140 § 391 shows that it is not proper to speak of a condition as *"als verwirklicht ausgesprochen"*. II 129. *"Der Konditionalsatz, insofern er eine Bedingung enthält, die nicht zugleich als verwirklicht ausgesprochen, oder schlechthin als unverwirklicht gedacht wird, lässt vielfach den Konjunctiv zu, obwohl er den Indikativ auch in diesen Fällen nicht ausschliesst."* It would be unfair to assume that this statement is intended to apply with strictness to Anglo-Saxon. Such a rule is simply a dignified way of covering the almost inevitable retreat before the subj. in modern English.

Expressing my dissatisfaction with the theory that the pres. subj. marks a purely hypothetical or ideal condition, or with the implication that its presence is fortuitious and irrational, I would state the outward circumstances of the great mass of conditional sentences with the pres. subj. in protasis, before venturing upon any path of my own theory. There is a certain humble satisfaction even in an unintelligent knowledge of the facts.

4. THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE IN PROTASIS.

A. The pres. subj. is found regularly in the protasis of a condition the apodosis of which expresses a command, a wish, or a moral obligation.

The indic. is admitted in such conditions usually under the influence of a Latin original.

B. The pres. subj. is found practically without exception in protases introduced by *buton* (*nemne* or *nymde*), in the senses of 'unless', 'except', 'if not'.

The following is an attempt at an explanation of these uses of the subj. confessedly at some points where I can detect nothing but a formal use, insufficient.

A. THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE IN THE PROTASIS TO A COMMAND OR WISH.

The following would seem to be the explanation of the subj. in the protasis of a command or wish.

The speaker introduces a strong subjective element into the sentence by the expression of his own desire or command. He thereby falls out of the role of mere reporter and expresses a particular interest in the relation. This element of will may extend through the whole sentence, and influence the verb of the protasis, which becomes subj, the proper mood for the expression of will or wish. The subj. in such clauses is then rather adhortative, at least in origin, than potential or hypothetical.

Hotz, (p. 55) has explained the phenomenon in a somewhat different way; and I am inclined to think that the explanation is right so far as it goes. The subj. appears in

the protasis on account of the striving for "symmetry"*) of form in the two members of the condition. It is therefore an analogical levelling due to the influence exerted by the subj. and imperative forms in the apodosis. We agree essentially but I have tried to explain the reason for this analogical change and to show that it is not wholly mechanical and irrational.

A citation from Prollius p. 19, will show that this view is no absolute novelty, and will give due credit to those who have previously held it. "*Der dennoch in vielen conditionalen Nebensätzen sich findende conj. præs. verdankt, wie schon Hotz a. a. O. p. 55 § 17 und Fleischhauer § 28 gezeigt haben, seine Entstehung nicht seiner absoluten Geltung, sondern vielmehr einer Beeinflussung des übergeordneten Satzes*". To Hotz belongs the credit of first stating this principle which in some form must eventually supersede those merely conventional explanations of the pres. subj. in protasis which still find their way into dissertations on Anglo-Saxon syntax.

Fully to persuade the adherents of the old view of this condition I am bound to show that such conditions are neither necessarily nor usually purely hypothetical. The principle involved in this construction will best be elucidated, by the citation of examples based on the same Latin which appear in several texts or which with similar protases have as apodoses respectively a simple statement and a command.

I hold that there is no trace of "pure hypothesis" in such a sentence as: *Fed donne min sceap, gif du me lufige*

*) The difficulty with this explanation as complete is that the apodosis of the *buton* condition almost invariably indie never influences the verb of the protasis which is invariably subj. Hotz has in some unaccountable way left out the *buton* clauses entirely in his dissertation, a most serious omission in an otherwise excellent piece of work.

C. P. 43,4. based on the Latin, *Si diligis me, pasce oves meas*, nor in this evidently independent translation, Gif du me lufge, læswa mine scep. Hom. I, 290, 30. This passage is a paraphrase from John, 21, 16. The Latin rightly expresses the condition by the indic; for the Saviour in making the command evidently neither intended to cast any doubt upon this love as something morely possible or conceivable, but knowing and accepting the love of Peter, he enforced by the thrice-given command we find in the Gospel, the obligation of service which that love brings with it. It seems to me that the passage hardly admits of any other exegesis. The condition then is not merely hypothetical, and the Anglo-Saxon has changed the mood in both instances either on account of the active interest and intent which lie in the whole thought, or from the demands of symmetry or from both reasons.

Another case shows the merest possibility of the dubitative use of the subj, though the Latin gives no countenance to such a view. Satan can hardly be accused of really doubting the divinity of Christ, or if doubting, of being undiplomatic enough to express the doubt. The only reason for a subj. in the Latin would be that the sentence is a mere taunt. Even the most radical exegetes will hold I think that the temptation was a real one. I cite four passages which are based on two Latin passages which have however the same moods and tenses. Assuming for brevity that this is the original of all., *Si filius Dei es, dic ut lapides isti panes fiant*, we have it translated closely, Gif þu Godes sunu sy, cwed þæt þas stanas to blafe gewurdon. Mat. 4, 3 and three times besides with subj. in protasis. Blick, 27,5; Lk. 4,3; Hom. I, 166,12; a change from the mood in Latin

which is hardly to be explained on any other theory than the one advanced above.

Similary *Si filius Dei es, mitte te deorsum*, though translated mechanically in Mat. 4,6; Gyf þu Godes sunu eart, asend þe þonne nyper, appears in four other cases with the pres., subj. in protasis Gif ðu Godes Sunu sy, feall nu adun, Hom. I 166,12 and 170,1; Blick. 27,10; Lk. 4,9.

March explains the following subj. as denoting a condition which is 'possible' Onsend Higelace gif mec hild nime, beadu-scruda betst, þæt mine breost wered. Beo. 452. cf. 1480. Without denying the correctness of the explanation, I am unable to see why it should not apply equally well to an indic. condition six lines previous. Ac he me habban wile dreore fahne, gif mec deað nimeð. Beo. 446. The subj. as before is to be explained by the presence of a mandatory apod. It would be absurd to say that one of these conditions is more real or probable than the other.

The following is a mere taunt and is not decisive for our principle; still the Latin shows the indic. against two translations by the subj. *Si filius Dei es, descende de cruce*; Gyf þu sy Godes Sunu, ga nyper of þære rode Mat. 27,40 also Hom. II, 256,5.

The apodosis may contain an expression of moral obligation or fitness, which amounts to a mild command. Ac gif we wilnigen (*conamur*) dæt he dæs wos geswicen, donne sculon we bie — — læran dæt he ne wilnigen leas gielpes C. P. 367,22; so 199,13. Gif hire donne se widsace, ðonne is cynn. dæt him spiwe dæt wif on dæt nebb. C. P. 45,2.

But it hardly needs extended proof to show that such conditions are very seldom to be classed as conditions of pure hypothesis or mere possibility; the fact lies in the very nature of the case. A command or an exhortation is usually

expressed not in view of a remote possibility but with reference to a known or definitely anticipated state of things.

Another and one of the strongest reasons for doubting that the note of hypothesis is dominant in the pres. subj. in Anglo-Saxon is that, except in indirect discourse or subordinate position, it is found only in the adhortative use in apodosis, and in other independent clauses it practically never expresses ideas of doubt nor of mere hypothesis. Outside of formal uses, wish and command are the most important ideas conveyed by the pres. subj. in Anglo-Saxon.

These conditions with adhortative apodoses do not necessarily take the subj. in protasis. The subjective relation to the protasis may be suppressed. Still excluding the Gospels which translate somewhat mechanically a large majority of such conditions have the subj. in apodosis.

If we may trust to the antiquity and reasonably faithful transmission, so far as syntax is concerned, by Alfred of Aedelbirhts Laws, circa 610, the indic. originally stood in such conditions and the subj. was just beginning to intrude at that time. There are only fifteen subjs to sixty five indic. in protasis in this code and part of these may admit of another explanation. The later laws generally show a somewhat irrational mixture of forms with a great preponderance of subjs; while a few have carried the subj. through consistently.

As indicated by some of the examples other elements as those of doubt or indefinite futurity may in isolated instances be found in such sentences, but the ruling principle for the choice of mood is that of will or wish. The other elements, unless accompanied by a command would hardly require the pres. subj.

B. THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE IN A PROTASIS INTRODUCED BY BUTON.

The protasis introduced by *buton* (*nemne* or *nymðe*), in the senses of 'unless', 'except', 'if not', practically without exception takes the subj. It is not easy to see the principle which lies behind this use in many cases. The apodosis takes the indic. We may distinguish two general heads.

1. The *buton* clause as a true exception.

Buton introduces a condition that must be excepted in thought before the apodosis can be conceived of as fulfilled — suggests an event which may be interposed to prevent the fulfilment of the main idea. It thus involves caution in statement, a special survey of the situation, and a reservation from the absolute statement. In most cases too it deals with contingencies in the indefinite future, and perhaps properly falls into the receptive category of "mere possibility", though not of "pure hypothesis". There would seem to be logical ground enough for the use of the subj. in this case, though I confess to an inability to formulate a wholly satisfactory reason for it, and to this extent perhaps the traditional view of the subj. is justified. At all events the subj. in the protasis whether formal or logical, is independent; neither influenced by nor influencing the mood of the apodosis.

Examples: *Ac hi gegaderiad monigfeald dysig on þære fortruwunga 7 on þam gilpe, butan heora hwele eft to hyre gecyrre* Cons. 6 h. *Micel yfel ded se de leas writ, buton he hit gebete.* Hom. II, 2,22. *Hio wind wid da god de mon ær gedon hæfd, buton mon simle swincende & wyrcente sie god weorc od ende.* C. P. 445,14. *Ealle we sind gelic æt-*

foran Gode. buton hwa oderne mid godum weorcum fordeo.
Hom. I, 260,24.

In the second case, buton introduces a condition without which the independent clause has no validity — states an indispensable condition. The independent clause contains the negation of an idea, which depends for its realization upon the condition introduced by buton. The formula is; This will not happen, unless this happen. This is the most common form of the buton condition.

I am unable to detect much of the element in these conditions, which traditionally demands the subj.; they seem to me to be usually a simple statement of the relation without particular subjective coloring. The contingency however becomes more stringent, when the condition is expressly stated as indispensable. This use of the subj. would seem on the whole to be formal rather than logical and possibly an analogical extension from the former class. At all events buton with the subj. is stereotyped in Anglo-Saxon.

Examples: Ne he on horses hricge cuman wolde, nemne hwilc mare nyd abædde. Beda 160,16. Monnan ic ne bite, nymde he me bite. Rid. 66,5. We ne bæoð na fulfremede, buton we beon afandode. Hom. I, 170,14. þonne forlyst he eall his aerran god, buton he hit gebete Cons. 1701. Ne bið nan fæsten gode gecweme, buton se man hine sylfne fram leahtrum forhæbbe Wulf. 286,12.

NOTE.

Genuine cases of buton with the indic. are very rare and were probably regarded as ungrammatical. Probably hardly half a dozen instances could be cited from a microscopic examination of all of Anglo-Saxon, excluding a few slavish translations in interlinear glosses. A sure case in L. W. S.

and the only one I have noted is. Forþon hiom sænd god on micelne brogan, fyr and hungor, buton hio to godes geleafan ær gecyrran willaþ. Wulf. 216,14.

REMARKS.

1. In this example from Beo. 1559 buton seems to have merely the modern, adversative sense of 'but'. þæt wæs wæpna cyst, buton hit was mare, donne ænig mon oðer to beadu-lace ætberan meahte.
2. The Indic. may follow, buton dæt, Cons. 4m, buton donne C. P. 399,3, buton fordyde C. P. 423, 22, and similar collocations. In most of these cases we have merely a contracted clause, which leaves the proper verb of buton to be supplied from the context. The verb in the indic. is properly not introduced by buton but by the following conjunction.

5.

THE INDICATIVE.

The indic. may now be considered briefly. It is the mood of simple, objective statement. It offers a condition or a hypothesis for judgment without implication or reservation.

a) The pres. indic. is used to express both present and future relations. The verbs *sculan* and *willan* had usually their full independent force. The forms of *beon* are preferred though not exclusively for expressing future relations of the substantive verb. *biod gemonigfaldade* (*multiplicabuntur*) Vesp. Ps. 138,18.

b) The pret. indic. represents the action as taking place in past time, absolute or relative. It is the simple, historical tense. Anglo-Saxon atready formed a perfect with *habbe* and the past. part. and a pluperfect, but they are rare and decidedly a subordinate element of style or of syntax.

THE PRETERITE SUBJUNCTIVE.

A. UNFULFILLED.

The pret. subj. is preëminently the mood of the unreal or unfulfilled condition. The construction seems exactly parallel with that in Latin. All the time relations expressed by the plup. and imp. subjs. in Latin are expressed by this one form of the verb. Examples are unnecessary at this point (cf. Sect. IV, class IV).

B. IDEAL.

The pret. subj. has also a restricted use as the form for the purely imaginary or ideal condition, wic̃h is expressed without reference to fact.

Job cwæð, Eala gif mine synna and min yrmd̃, þe ic dolige, wæron awegene on anra wægan, þonne wæren hi swærran gesewene donne sand corn on sæ. Hom. II, 454, 22. Aelfric's translation of Job. 12⁶ is a verbal repetition of this earlier rendering.

Gif ge nu gesawen hwelce mus þæt wære hlaford ofer oþre mys 7 sette him domas 7 nidde hie æfter gafole, hu wunderlic wolde eow þæt þincan. Cons. Cp. 16, § 2, p. 52 h.

NOTE.

The form of the weak preterite in Late West-Saxon.

This note illustrates a fact noted in passing by Sweet (Anglo-Saxon Reader xcvi): — — “in the later language where there is no distinction between indic. and subj. in the preterite of weak verbs”. It may be a mere subtlety to inquire whether the subj. function has gone over to and been superadded upon the indic. form, or whether the indic. form

has levelled out the only distinctly subj. form remaining, so that we have essentially two moods distinguished by function but not by form yet since many of the pret. subj. forms still remain distinct and since even in ambiguous forms the difference in function is so plain, it seems worth while to maintain the latter view as a more reasonable interpretation of the fact. I am loath to give up the subj. pret. form of weak verbs and to admit that it has become wholly fused with the pret. indic. for we find it fulfilling exactly the same functions as it did when the distinction of moods was clearest. Accordingly I think that an alternative -st ending should be added in the paradigm for the 2nd sing. pret. subj. of weak verbs in Late West-Saxon.

Reference to the paradigm of weak verbs will show that the only forms of the pret. indic. and pret. opt. with different endings in Late West-Saxon were the second persons singular, as: þu hæfdest beside þu hæfde. We must recognize the fact that even this single difference disappears in the later mss. and that the indic. 2nd sing. displaced the corresponding form in the subj., and the moods became exactly alike in form and only distinguished by difference of function. The proof of this is that forms apparently indic. are found in unreal and ideal conditions at a time when such conditions in all unambiguous cases require the pret. subj., and when, except in this apparent case, they never admit a plainly indic. form.

Gif þu wistest hwæt þe toweard is, þonne weope du mid me Hom. I, 404,27. as proved by the context and by the form weope, is an unfulfilled condition. Wite þu for soð, gif þæt þine agne welan wæron þe þu mændest þæt þu forlure, ne mihtest þu hi forleosan Cons. cp. 7, § 3, p. 20^m *Audacter adfirmem, si tua forent quae amissa*

conquereris nullo modo perdidisses. So 'mihtest': Cons. cp. 36, § 2; 74h. Ic wat gif þu nu hæfde (Bod. næfdest) fullne anweald dines selves, ðonne hæfdest du hwæt hwega on þe selfum dæs þe næfre þinum willum alætan woldest, ne seo wyrd þe on geniman ne mihte Cons. cp. 11, § 2, 34h. The later Bodleian ms. shows an additional bad reading with the —st form the original must have had hæfde in both clauses. Ic wolde cweþan þæt þu nþwita wære, gif þu gefyldig wære 7 geswugian mihtest (Cott. meahte) Cons. cp. 18, § 3, 20m. *Inteleixeram, inquit, si tacuisses.* The superior Cotton ms. has preserved the original reading meahte.

Eala gif þu wistest — — Lk. 18,42. *quia si cognouisses.* — -- The list could be enlarged and other cases are cited in the course of the dissertation, but these instances will suffice to establish the fact.

7. TABULAR CONSPECTUS.

It may be well to give a brief conspectus of the normal use of moods and tenses in the conditional period.

PROTASIS.

a. The present indicative.

The pres. indic. may be used to express any pres. or fut. relation that is not unreal or purely imaginary, except in the condition with buton. (Cf. Sect. IV, class I A).

b. The preterite indicative.

The pret. indic. is used:

- 1) To express a real or logical condition in past time (cf. Sect. IV, class I B);

- 2) or rarely, following a pret. in indirect discourse (cf. Sect. VII, 2).

c. The present subjunctive.

The pres. subj. is used :

- 1) In a protasis the apodosis of which is a command, or wish (cf. Sect. IV, class II);
- 2) In a clause introduced by *buton* (*nemue*, *nymde*) (cf. Sect. IV, class V);
- 3) Often in indirect discourse (cf. Sect. VII 1);
- 4) In a few limited and miscellaneous cases (cf. Sect. IV, class III, appendix).

d. The preterite subjunctive.

The pret. subj. is used :

- 1) In a purely imaginary or ideal condition (cf. Sect. IV, class III);
- 2) In a condition that is unreal or unfulfilled (cf. Sect. IV, class IV):
- 3) In indirect discourse following a pret. (cf. Sect. VII, 2).

APODOSIS.

a. The present indicative.

The pres. indic. is used in the apodoses of a,
b 1, c 2.

b. The preterite indicative.

The pret. indic. is used in the apodosis of b.

c. The present subjunctive.

The pres. subj. *adhor.* (or the *imp.*) is used in the apodosis of c 1, and rarely in that of a and b (cf. Sect. IV, class II, note).

Otherwise the pres. subj. appears in the apodosis only in indirect discourse or other subordinate construction.

d. The preterite subjunctive.

The pret. subj. is used in the apodosis of d.

Formal conditions without conditional significance may well be considered and dismissed in the following, short section before proceeding to the general classification.

III.

FORMAL CONDITIONS WITHOUT CONDITIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

1. INDIRECT QUESTIONS.

These form the largest category. Gif has the force of hwæder. The mood is usually the indic.

þu wast, gif hit is, swa we soþlice secgan hyrdan Beo. 272. Smeaga nu gehwa on his mode, gif ðas beboda and odre þillice habbað ænigne stede on his heortan, ðonne tocnæwd he hwæder he is from Gode Hom. II, 228,20. cwedende, gif is rihtic ðæm menn forleta wif his. Mat. L. 19, 3. *dicentes: Si licet homini dimittere uxorem suam.*

Except for the stereotyped form wære which follows a pret.

þa befran Judas gif he hit wære. Hom. II, 244,6 also II, 250,28.

þæt he þone wisan wordum nægde, frean Ingwina, frægn gif him wære æfter neodlādum niht getæse. Beo. 1318.

2. CONCESSIVE CONDITIONS.

A formal condition may have an adversative sense and therefore belong properly to the concessive construction.

The following sentence is confirmed as a concessive construction by the Latin. Gif we nauht dæs ne dood de us mon mid goode leanian dyrfe, ne do we eac nan woh de

us mon fore tælan ðurfe. C. P. 337, 20, *et si digna misericordiae retributione non agimus, nulla tamen perversa perpetravimus.* and gif eowere synna wæren wolcureade ær dan, hi beod scinende on snawes hwitnesse. Hom. II, 322,10. Also Hom. I, 350,2.

3.

OPTATIVE CONDITIONS.

The condition expressing a strenuous wish difficult or impossible of attainment by the pret. subj. is to my feeling usually purely formal, and eala gif is to be translated merely 'would that'. The mechanical explanation based on the probable origin of the construction, is that we must assume ellipsis of an apodosis expressing some such idea as 'how good', or 'how much better it would be'.

Eala gif ic moste ðam eadigan Laurentiam geefenlæcan. Hom. I, 432,10. Eala gif ðu wære hund! Hund is sawulleas, and on helle ne ðrowað Hom. II, 308,13.

The following instance shows that use noted previously of the pret. indic. form for the pret. subj. which is found in nearly all late texts. Eala gif ðu witan woldest þære halgan rode gerynu Hom. I, 588,17.

4.

CONDITIONS OF COURTEOUS ADDRESS.

Certain forms of address which are not very common in Anglo-Saxon should receive mention here. Grammatically they occur generally in complete conditional sentences, but logically they have no more conditional force than the modern, courteous formula 'if you please'.

From the preface to the Pastoral Care. Fordy me ðyncd betre, gif iow swa ðyncd, ðet we eac sumæ bec — —

on dæt gediode wenden — — C. P. 7,6. Similarly a condition may be used as a rhetorical form. Gif hwa þonne cwyð: Hwæt ete we on þam seofodan geare, gif we ne sawað ne ne gaderiað ure wæstmas? (21) Ac eow sylle mine bletsunga þæt an gear bringð þreora geara wæstmas. Lev. 25,20. “(Gif hwa þonne cwyð *hat den Sinn von*: “*Es könnte wohl Einer sagen — —*” *Worauf dann*: (21) *ich aber gebe Euch etc*)” Wohlfahrt s. 20.

Possibly several of the conditions treated under IV, 3 appendix 1 “Formulas of address” should have been included rather in this category. The fact that they all had the pres. subj. in protasis seemed to justify their present classification.

IV.

GENERAL CLASSIFICATION OF CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

A practical classification of conditions under five heads is immediately suggested by the treatment of moods and tenses.

First, must come the great class of simple or logical conditions with the indic. in both clauses.

Second, the conditions which with a mandatory apodosis have regularly the subj. in protasis. This class is so important for Anglo-Saxon that the erection of an especial category for it seems justified; and its logical nature suggests that it follow the simple condition immediately.

Third, the ideal condition which is regularly expressed by the pret. subj. in both clauses. As an appendix to this class the instances of the pres. subj. in protasis not included under class two may be appropriately collected.

Fourth, the unfulfilled or unreal condition, which takes the pret. subj. in both clauses.

Fifth, the exceptive condition, introduced by *buton* *nemne*, or *nymde*, which has the subj. in protasis, forms appropriately a special class, though logically it is related sometimes to class three, some times to class one.

For the sake of clearness, indirect discourse, contraction

and ellipsis, and conditions expressed by forms usually non conditional have been kept out of the general classification and relegated to special sections for fuller consideration.

CLASS I. THE SIMPLE OR LOGICAL CONDITION.

The speaker simply asserts the relation between two ideas, without any implication as to the intrinsic validity of the ideas themselves. The hearer is supposed to test the matter by the standard of fact. Such conditions are by far the most numerous in Anglo-Saxon. There is a tendency to include all pres. and fut. conditions under this form. The indic. is found in both protasis and apodosis.

A) All such conditions in pres. and fut. time are expressed by the pres. indic.

- 1) With a simple statement as apodosis. Fut. condition :
 gif ic eft gefare (*vicero*) swelcne sige æt Romanum,
 þonne mæg ic siþþan buton ælcon þegne Creca
 lond secan (*revertero*) Or. 156,31. Swa mære ge
 beoð swa swa englas, gif ge of þam treowe etad.
 Hom. I, 176,20.

Pres. condition: Gif se blinda done blindan læt,
 he feallad began on ænne pytt. C. P. 29,7 — he sceal
 hyran feondan, gif he nele freondum. Wulf 177,10.
 Gif ge soðlice ne forgyfad mannum, ne eower Fæder
 forgyfd eow eowre synna. Mat. 6,15. Fordi is se
 man betere, gif he gode gedihd, þonne eall ða nytenu
 sindon. Hom. I, 16,14.

REMARKS. FORMATION OF THE PROTASIS WITHOUT GIF.

1. Inversion.

The protasis may be formed by inversion of the word order
 Copula-subj. etc. without a conditional conjunction. The subj. is

generally found in these inverted clauses, but it would seem not in its logical force. The change of mood is probably formal and due merely to the inversion, for we find in close connection with these inverted clauses direct clauses of precisely the same nature which take the indic. The ambiguous 'clipped' plu. forms with post-positive pronoun may have had some influence in inducing the subj. form in the inverted clauses. Inversion is instanced in nearly all the texts but is comparatively rare.

Gewite *þæt* ungesewenlice ut, *þonne* fylð adune *þæt* gesewenlice, forðan *þe* hit ne stod na ær ðurh hit sylf. Hom. I, 160,5. Gewite seo sawul ut, ne mæg se muð clypian, *þeah* ðe he gynige, ne eage geseon, *þeah* ðe hit open sy: ne nan him ne deð nan ðing, gif se lichama bið sawulleas. Hom. I, 160,5. The final indic. condition proves the logical nature of the two inverted conditions. Gif rice wif and earm acennað togædere, gangon hi aweig; nast ðu hwæder bið *þæs* rican wifan cild, hwæder *þæs* earman. Hom. I, 256,13. And hit bið to menigfeald, gewurde hit *þridan* siðe, and mid ealle misdon gewurde hit feorðan siðe. Wulf 305,1. Followed immediately by the exactly parallel condition. and, gif hit oftur gewyð, nyte we, hu *þæt* faran mæg. Wulf. 305,6. Such collocations of the subj. and indic. go far to prove that the subj. is formal and not logical in such inverted clauses.

A case with the indic. noted by Mätzner: bið se torr *þyrel*, ingong geopenað, *þonne* ic ærest him *þurh* eargfare in onsende, in breostsefan hitre ge*þoncas*. Jul. 402. The following 'clipped' form is probably to be regarded as an indic. geseo we ænigne mann *þe* georne hine sylfue to nrum godum bugan wylle. eall *þæt* he ær agylte — — we lætað hit of gemynde. Saints 23, 276.

2. Imperative condition.

A command expressed by the imper. or subj. may form a protasis when the results which will follow the assumed fulfilment of the command are stated. The command and results may be in the same or in different sentences. Berað eowre byrðenne gemænelice betwux iow, ðonne gefylle ge Godes æ. C. P. 395,34. Invicem onera vestra portate, et sic adimplebitis legem Christi.

Nelle ge (nolite) deman 7 ge ne beoð demede; nelle ge genyðrian

7 ge ne beoð genyþernde; forgyfað 7 eow byð forgyfen. Lk. 6,37. 'Forgyfað' in the last sentence shows that the two previous 'clipped' forms are imperatives.

Gecyrraþ to me, þonne gecyrre ic to eow. Blick 103,1.

Do well on eallum dinum life, and we siddan æfter dinum weldædum bliðne ðe eft genimað to us. Hom. II, 346,16. uton andettan ure synna — — — þonne beorge (15) we us sylfum wið ece wite and geearniað us heofona rice. Wulf 115,6—15. In an exactly similar passage we find the condition repeated in regular form. uton geswican unrihtes and gebugan to rihte, þonne geearnige we, gif we þæt willað sona godes mildse. Wulf. 129,11. The following rendering of a Latin condition is noteworthy: Do nu of ðam feorðan dæle on þinum mode, eall þæt seo sæ his ofseten hæfþ 7 eall ða sceand ðe heo him ongenumen hæfþ, 7 eall þæt his fennas 7 moras genumen habbað 7 eall þon eallum ðeodum westes ligeþ; ðonne miht ðu ongitan þætte þæs ealles nis monnum þonne mare læfed to bugianne, buton swelce an lytles cafertun Cons. cp. 18, § 1, p. 62^m. Huic quartae, si quantum maria paludesque premunt, quantumque siti vasta regio distenditur cogitationes subtraxeris, vix angustissima inhabitaudi hominibus area relinquetur. cf. Cons. cf. 32, § 2, p. 116h. where there is no Latin original.

3. Periphrastica condition.

The periphrasis on þa gerad, may introduce a condition. The subj. may be found in the clause which elucidates gerad.

Swa ic wolde, la Mod þæt þu fore up to us, gif ðe lyste, on þa gerad þæt þu eft mid us þa eorþan secan wille for godra manna þearfe Cons cp. 7, § 3, p. 22^h. Ascende si placet, sed ea lege, ne uti cum ludicri mei ratio poscet, descendere in iniuriam putes.

þonne is hit aledfed, þæt he mot mete þycgan on þa gerad, þe he his ælmessan sylle. Wulf. 285,3 repeated l. 6. Also Or. 52,33; 122,3. Chron. E 1091, p. 229¹.

2) The apodosis may be an Exclamation or a question.

a) Which is rhetorical and expects a negative answer, or dissent from the conclusion.

Gif donne se sacerð bið ungerað ðæs lareowdomes, hwæt forstent donne his gehlyd? C. P. 91,24.

Hu mæg donne ænig man ryhtwislice 7 gesceadwislice acsigan, gif he nan grot rihtwisnesse on him næfþ? Cons. 156 h.

Gif ge ða ane lufiað þe eow lufiað, hwilce mede hæbbe ge þonne æt Gode? Hom. II, 216,20. Hwile fæder wille syllan his cilde stan, gif hit hine blafes bitt? oððe næddran gif hit fises bitt? etc. Hom. I, 250,7. God is sealt; gif hit awyrð, on þam þe hit gesylt bið? Lk. 14,34.

- b) Which is rhetorical and expects assent from the hearer. The words *hu ne*, in North. and Merc. *ah ne*, in the sense of *nonne* often introduce the apodosis.

Oððe gif hwele folc bið mid hungre geswenced, & hwa his hwæte gehyt & odhielt, hu ne wilt he donne hiera deaðes? C. P. 377,8, and gif man oðrum miltsað, hu micele swidor wile God miltsian and arian mannum his handgeweorc. Hom. I, 68, 23. and gif bisceopas forgymað — — (177) wa heom þære swigean! Wulf. 176, 28+.

- c) The question may not suggest the answer directly. It is proposed so that the hearer may supply the proper conclusion to the condition, or with the purpose, of gaining information, or of forcing the hearer to admit the validity of the condition.

Forþam gif hig on grenum treowe þæs þing doð, hwæt doð hig on þam drigean? Lk. 23,31. Gyf min broðor syngað wið me, mot ic him for gyfan oð seofon sidas? Mat. 18,21. Gif David hyne on gaste Dryhten clypað, hu is he his sunu? Mat. 22,45.

Gif ic soð secge, hwi nelle ge me gelyfan. Hom. II, 226,5. cf. Jn. 8,46.

Such variations of the apodosis will be found in other classes, but having once called attention to their main varieties, it will be unnecessary to carry this merely formal and obvious classification of protases through beyond this large branch of the logical condition.

B) The logical condition in past time.

The pret. indic. is found in the protasis of the simple condition in past time. It is the form in direct narration. The apodosis may of course be in any time subsequent to that of the condition, that is with reference to the speaker in past, present or future time. The verb then of the apodosis may be in the pret. or in the pres. indic. As in the simple, pres. condition the apod. may be a simple statement, or its equivalent an exclamation or a question.

1. Apodosis with pret. indic.

Gif hie þonne soð ne sædon, þonne næron naþer gode ne þa ne nu. Or. 86,10. Gif two men oþer iii coman ridend to an tun, al þe þ(?)unscipe flugæn for heom. Chron E 262,34 (Peterboro). Gif ic ryhtwis wæs, ne ahof ic me no forðy. C. P. 253,7. Ond he þes biscop ricum monnum no for are ne for ege næfre foreswigian nolde, gif heo on hwon agylton. Beda 162,12.

2. Apodosis with pres. indic.

Gif Crist for us eallum dead was, donne weordad ealle men deade. C. P. 43,9. Gif we god underfengon of Godes handa, hwi ne sceole we eac yfel underfon? Hom. II, 452,32.

Gif hi mid ænigan þingan Cristan gegladodan, on þisum earman life, þonne habbaþ hi reste from þære nontide þæs seternesdæge oþ þæs monandæges lihtincge. Wulf. 219,35. and gif hi min ehton, þonne ehtad hi eac eower. Hom. I, 556,2.

REMARKS.

1. Inversion.

An interesting and possibly isolated example of an idiom that still survives is: And nan man ne dorste slean oðerne man, næfde he næfre swa mycel yfel gedon wið þone oðerne. Chron. E, 222,7. The sense is rather concessive than conditional.

2. Periphrastical condition.

The periphrasis on þæt gerad is found with a subj. due to the grammatical subordination of the following clause. 7 siex hund gisla on his geweald underfeng, on þæt gerad þæt hie him siþþan ece þeowas wæren. Cr. 122,3. F. Cr. 52,33. Her Eadmund oferhergode eal Cumberland, and hit let to eal Malculme Scotta cyninge, on þæt gerad þæt he wære his midwyrhta ægþer ge on sæ ge on lande. Chron. 945.

CLASS II. CONDITIONS WITH MANDATORY APODOSES.

Conditions the apodoses of which express a 'command', 'exhortation', or 'moral obligation' have generally the pres. subj. in protasis.

These conditions are most of them logical, but since Anglo-Saxon changed the mood in most cases it seems desirable to make a separate division for this characteristic construction. The indic. is freely admitted, but generally under Latin influence; and the better texts show a preponderance of the subj., abundantly large to establish it as the better idiom.

A. THE APOD. IS A COMMAND, WISH OR EXHORTATION.

1. Apodosis with the imperative.

sec, gif þu dyre! Beo. 1379. Saga, gif þu cunne El. 856. cf. Rid. 33,13. Gif du wille din lac bringan (*offers*) to ðam wiofnde, & ðu ðonne ryhte ofðence hwæthwugu ðæs ðe din niehsta widerweardes gedon hæbbe, forlæt ðonne an ðin lac beforan ðam weofude, and fer ærest æfter him etc. C. P. 349,9. Gif he Godes man sy, fylgad ge him Beda 100,23 from *Si homo Dei est, sequimini illum*. Gif se lareow wel tæce and yfele bysnige, dod swa he tæcd, and na be ðam þe he bysnad. Hom. I, 242,22. cf. II, 48,34 and contrast Hom. II, 50,3, indic. conditions, which differ only by the absence of a command in the apodosis

NOTE. THE PRES. INDIC. IS FOUND IN THESE CONDITIONS,

especially in the Gospels; very seldom in Alfredian texts; often in Aelfric.

Eornostlice gyf þu bringst (offeret Fut.) þine lac to weofode and þu þær geþencest þæt þin brodor hæfd ænig þing agen þe; Læt þær þine lac beforan þam altare etc. Mat. 5,23 & 24. Hom. I, 54,19. Fæder gif þu wilt (vis) afyr þysne calic fram me. R and L have welle.) Lk. 22,42. Gif ðu wylt becuman to ðan ecan life, heald þas bebodu. Hom. II, 400,5.

2) Apodosis with the Subj. (adhortative).

and gif heo bearn hēbbe, feo ðet bearn to ðem londum efter hire; O. E. T. Charter 45,1 15. Gif his hwa sie lustfull mare to witanne, sece him þonne self þæt Or. 100,25. Gif he þonne eow eac forhogie 7 eow ne wille arisan, mid þy eower ma is, sy he þonne from eow forhogad. Beda 102,2. utan frefrian ahwænede and heortan ormode, alysan gehæfte, gif us to þam onhagige. Wulf. 209,5. Gif hwam twinige be ðam gemænelicum æriste, þonne nnderstande he þisne drihtenlican cwyde. Hom. I 132,27.

The desire may be expressed by an expression like *ic bidde*, instead of a hortatory *snhj*.

Gif hit nænge þinga to dæge beon mægge, ic halsio þætte ne sy long fæc bitweonum. Beda 290,21. translates *Si nullatenus hodie fieri potest, obsecro, ne sit longum spatium in medio*. Similarly. Gif hit eallinga þus aræded seo (*definitum est*) 7 þes cwide onwended beon ne mote, ic biddo 7 halsio þæt ne sy mare fæc betweonum þon þeos nehsta neaht an. Beda 290,23.

NOTE. THE PRES. INDIC. IS FOUND RARELY IN THESE CONDITIONS.

Gif ðu þæs þing dest (*facis*), geswutela þe sylfne middan-earde. Jn. 7,4. Gif hie ðonne giet ðær tueonað (*du bitant*), gongen ðonne to ðæm halgum gewritum, frine ðara hwæt he don oððe læran scylen. C. P. 103, 9. Gif we untrume beoð, uton beon gedýldige, swa swa se eadigra Job us eollum bysnode. Hom. II, 328,24.

B. THE APODOSIS EXPRESSES A 'MORAL OBLIGATION',

or a suggestion of what is 'befitting' in view of the protasis.

Such an expression is usually a disguised or a weakened form of the speakers command or wish. The apodosis contains words, like *sculan* (in the sense of 'ought' only), *him is þearf*, *is cynn*, the inflected infinitive with *eom* or *beom*, etc.

Ac gif we wilnigen (*conamur*) ðæt hie dæs wos geswicen, ðonne sculon we hie — — læran ðæt he ne wilnigen leas gilpes. C. P. 367,22. gif hit þonne deað wuððe butan fulluhte and hit on þam preoste gelang sy — — þonne sceal he þolian his hades. Wulf. 300,18. Gif hit sie mannes gemet þæt he ciricean halgan sceole, ðonne is hit ealles gerisnost þæt bit sy on ðæm dæge ðe se sige onweald wæs; Blick 205,23. Gif hire ðonne se widsæce, ðonne is cynn ðæt him spiwe ðæt wif on ðæt nebb. C. P. 45,2. Gif hwyle þonne ofer þæt

gefremman, þonne seondon heo to bescyrienne (*pruandi sunt*) Cristes lichoman 7 blodes. Beda 74,16.

NOTE. INDIC. IN PROTASIS.

Such conditional sentences have naturally the indic. in protasis more frequently than those under A. Still a majority take the subj.

Ne sceole we tellan, gif we hwæt lytles to gode gedoð, ac we sceolon geriman ure misdæda. Hom. II, 430,6. Mine gebroðra, gif ge gode sind, þonne sceole ge emlice wiþercorenca manna yfelnysse forberan. Hom. I, 526,33.

Class III.

THE IDEAL CONDITION.

The ideal or purely hypothetical condition is usually expressed with the pret. subj. in both protasis and apodosis.

The conditional ideas expressed are purely imaginary. They are not to be tested by their correspondence to fact, but by the validity of the relation established between the ideas and its aptness for illustration. Such conditions constitute a very small class in Anglo-Saxon.

The very few conditions having the pres. subj. in protasis, which are not explained under other heads will be appended here, as more nearly related to the ideal condition than to any other.

Ideal condition.

Eala þætte ðis moncyn wære gesælig, gif heora mod (76) wære swa riht 7 swa gestapelod! Cons. cp. 21, p. 741+. possibly unreal but translating! *O felix hominum genus, si uestros animos amor quo caelum regitur regat.* and ðeah he nu þa þreo hæfde, gif he nære hliseadig, ðonne, wære him (122) ðeah sumes weord scipes wana. Cons. cp. 33, § 1, p. 1201+.

Menig man is cristen geteald on sibbe, þe wolde swide hraðe widsacan Criste, gif him man bude þæt man bead þam

martyrum. Hom. I, 212,25. Hwa wolde me æfre gelyfan, gif ic wolde gereccan þæt ðornas getacnodan welan, ðonne þornas priciað, and ða welan gelust fulliað? Hom. II, 88,17. Gif nu eall þises middaneardes wele come to anum men, hu ne wæron þonne ealle oþre men wæðlan butan him? Cons. cp. 13, p. 38m. *At eadem si apud unum quanta est, ubique gentium congeratur, ceteros sui inopes fecerit.* Gif ða ealle awritene wæron, ic wene ne mihte þes middaneard ealle þa bec befon. John 21,25. *quia si scribantur* etc.

With the apod. in adhortative form. Gif eow swa lice þuhte, utan gangan on þisum carcerne and hine ut forlætan, Blick 247,1; in the more vivid form with pres. indic. Gif hwa alefed wære, oððe limleas on þisum life, he bið ðonne swa hit awriten is etc. Hom. I, 236,28.

APPENDIX: THE PRES. SUBJ. IN PROTASIS.

In instances neither introduced by buton, nor induced by a command or a wish in the apod.

The aggregate of such cases is small, and the average for a text is only three to four. It seems quite impossible to state a principle which will cover all the cases. Some are undoubtedly capricious variations. The small number of these cases is in evidence that the pres. subj. was not the case of mere possibility or assumption. Practically all the cases put under such rubrics in the dissertations belong under class II.

1. Formulas of address.

With inversion, probably subj. but possibly 'clipped' indic. Ac frine hie þonne æfter hu monegum wintrum sio sibb gewurde — —: þonne is þæt æfter L wintra 7 feower hundum. Or. 182,16. also Absige þonne — — 182,19. Gif

þu þonne dæt gemet habban wille 7 þa nyd þearfe witan wille, þonne is þæt mete 7 drync 7 clapas * * * þæt þe is gecynde. Cons. cp. 14, § 1, p. 42h.

In all these cases the proper apodoses are lacking. A similar condition with apodosis: Gif hwa smeaga hu ðis ge-wurde, þonne secge we, þæt des martyr his lyf adreah on læwedum hade. Hom. I, 452,24. Wilt ðu, wit unc abbidde ondrincan? cwæd ic: Ic wille 7 me leof is, gif ðu mæge. Beda 392,32. The condition is merely a courteous form, and the sentence might properly be paraphrased and modernised thus: Do you wish us to order anything to drink? I said. 'I should like it, if it is convenient'. To make this a subj. of 'doubt' or of 'mere possibility', would be to put a rank discourtesy into Bishop Wilfrid's mouth and that to a lady, the Abbess Hereburh, in doubting the resources of her refectory.

This subj. was probably a more courteous form of address than the indic., though there is hardly enough material to make the point perfectly clear.

2. A, modest, guarded, or tentative statement of a condition.

Ic seolfa cude sumna broðar, ðone ic wolde dæt ic næfre cude, dæs noman ic eac swylce gemunan mæg, gif dæt owiht bryciæ. Beda 442,9. *cuius etiam nomen, si hoc aliquid prodesset, dicere possem.* We willað nu mid sumere sceortre trahtunge þæs rædinge oferyrnan, and geopenian, gif heo hwæt digles on hyre hæbbende sy. Hom. I, 388,29. The condition prepares the hearers minds for difficulties in the lesson, by suggesting only the possibility of their existence. Gif hwa elles secge, we sceotað to him. Hom. II, 306,19 The context from Thorpes translation is.

"Thus wrote Jerome, the wise expositor, concerning the holy rood, how it was found. If any one say otherwise we refer to him". Aelfric anticipates any possible disagreement, without wishing to assume its actual existence in his audience. So: We willað eow geswutelian nu ærest, gif eower hwyle nyte hwæt mannes Bearn sy, þæt Crist sylf is mannes Bearn. Hom. II, 106,38. A repetition of this sentence is in Wulf 288,4. The idea behind the following subj. is reverence. gif þin willa sie, wuldres aldor, þæt me wærlogan sweordum aswebban, ic beo sona gearu to adreoganne, þæt þu, dryhten min, edelleasum deman wille. Andr. 70. So: Elene 788.

3. Ideas of doubt or of incomplete knowledge.

Ac to hwon yldest þu þæt þu raþost do, gif þu God sy, þæt man þas menn witnige & cwelle. Blick 138,1. Hom. I, 598,5. Gif ðu from þissum mæssepreoste gefulwad wære, þonne ne eart ðu fulfremedlice no on riht gefullwad. Beda 402,26. wære because the bishop speaks only on the authority of what Herebald has just told, and casts the responsibility of the statement upon him. It is a sort of logical indirect discourse. A some what similar case, though the mood may be also influenced by the imperative: Gif þis gebod wære eow. geseald (as you say it was) fram eowerum Drihtne, astigad hider mid gefean on min scip. Blick 233,21. contrast the parallel passage in Andreas. 344 where we have indic., although the construction hardly varies otherwise except in the absence of a command. Gif ge syndon þegnas þæs þe þrym ahof ofer middangeard, swa ge me secgaþ, 7 ge geheoldon, þæt eow se halga bead, þonne ic eow mid gefean ferian wille ofer brimstreamas. Similar with pret. subj. in protasis is Hom. II, 144,15. Possibly both instances should have been included under Class II.

4. Miscellaneons.

A case where the illustration is in the indic. and the application in the subj. There is possibly a glimmer of deprecation not of denial (Hotz 46) in the subj. conditions. They could certainly be as well expressed by the indic. The anticipation of the restriction expressed by eallunga may affect the mood of the first subj. condition. gif þara lima hwile of biþ, ðonne ne biþ hit no full mon swa hit ær was, gif eac hwylc god man from gode gewite, ðonne ne biþ he þe ma fullice god, gif he eallunga from gode gewite Cons. cp. 37, § 3, p. 1901. Similar is, Hom. I, 292,23.

A very rare use of the subj. to express ability is instanced in; þonne ne reccap hi (the wood-fowl) þara metta, gif hi þæs wuda benugon (may enjoy). Cons. cp. 25, p. 88m.

I can see no reason for the subj. in this case; or if it is 'ideal' as seems possible, why the apodosis should have the logical form. Gif ðonne hwele mon mæge gesion (*poterit notare*) ða birhtu þæs heofonlican leohtes mid bluttrum eagum his Modes, ðonne wile he cweþan þæt sio beorhtnes þære sunnan sciman sie þæsternes to metanne wiþ þa ecan birhtu. Cons. cp. 34, § 8, p. 146h.

In the following example secge is probably subj., from mæge. Hwæþer ðu hit asweotolor ongiton mæge, gif ic ðe sumne bisne get secge. Cons. cp. 34, § 4, 138m.

A condition in which the subject is indefinite is found with the subj.: Ac þæt he tæld to unalyfedlicere wiglunge, gif hwa ða wyrta on him becnitte, buton he hi to ðam dolge gelecge. Hom. I, 476, 4.

5. A few cases nearly related to. class II.

The apodosis contains an expression of obligation or fitness.

Fulwian þonne þæt cennende wiif oðþe þæt bearn þæt þær accened bið, gif heo syn þreade (*urgetur*) mid frecenisse deaðes — — nænige gemete is bewered. Beda 76,19. The apodosis is a negative expression of 'it is right' or 'fitting'. We motan swyþe wærlice on ælce wisan us heal-dan, gif we sceolon us mid deofol gescyldan. Wulf 301,5. Motan plainly expresses obligation. Sceolon in form can be indic. Gif hwam twinige be æriste, þonne mæg he under-standan on þisum godspelle, þæt þær bið soð ærist. Hom. I, 503,4. I incline to believe that the implied suggestion, (cf. the disguised command, Cæd. Gen. 425), that the hearer learn, has influenced the mood, while I realize that it may be only a courteous and guarded form of address as noted previously. In the instance, gif we gemete sin on mold wege, oððe teor oððe near fundne weorðan, hæst hi usic bindan and in bælwylme suslum swingan. Jul. 334, the subjs. may be caused by the verb of commanding hæst. The elliptical construction, gif þu wene, þæt hit þín bocland sy, þæt þu on eordast — hit þonne wæron mine wæter, þa þe on heofenum wæron, þonne ic mine gife eordwaram dælde. Wulf 260,2 admits of a double explanation. First that the condition to sy is properly concessive (so Cæd. Gen. 657 is to be explained), or second and more probable that an imperative is implied, as, 'If you think it is your land, remember that the waters were mine etc.' Ex. 22² owes its subj. to its surrounding of legal conditional sentences with mandatory apodoses. In the case: Hu wilt þu nu andwyrdan þæm woruld sælpum, gif he cwedað to ðe? etc. Cons. cp. 7, § 5, p. 221 the better Cott. ms gives the alternative reading cwedað.

More space has been devoted to this small class than it deserves intrinsically. Still since the citations are complete for my own reading they show how limited was the use of the

pres. subj. outside of the categories specified in classes II and V and I think dispose quite effectually of the 'mere hypothesis' theory as an explanation of the pres. subj. or a principle of classification. And it is noteworthy that the instances cited fall into small, special classes, leaving II and V the only classes that include any significant number of pres. subjs.

Class IV. THE UNFULFILLED OR UNREAL CONDITION.

The pret. subj. is found in both members of the sentence. The construction seems to be precisely like that in the Latin unreal condition, except that the Anglo-Saxon expressed by one tense the pret., the time relations for which the Latin used two, the imper. and plup. subjs.

A. The condition is unfulfilled in past time.

* * Scipio se consul 7 ðær freceŋlice gewandod weard, 7 eac ofslagen wære, gif his sunu his ne gehulpe. Or. 186,23.

Ne gefiolle he no on sære opene scylde ðæt he his brodur ofslage, gif he ær ne geæfstgode ðætte his brodur lac wæron doncweordlicor onfongne donne his C. P. 235,2. *nisi enim Cain incidisset acceptam fratris hostiam, minime pervenisset ad extinguendum vitam.* Gif þæt deofol hine ne gesawe on ure gecyrd, ne costode he hine. Blick 33,35 gif we hit forsuwian dorston, ne sæde we hit eow Hom. II, 324,23. forði buton he drowode for us, ne mihte ure man cuman to godes rice. Hom. II, 40,29. Buton in this case has only the force of gif — — ne. So nefne: Grendel — — acwealde, swa he hyra ma wolde, nefne him witig god wýrd forstode and ðæs mannes mod. Beo. 1055. Fordon gif þu þisses monnes fea in his synnum deades ne onfenge, ne burne

his wiite on þe. Beda 216,7. translates slavishly: *Si enim huius uiri in peccatis suis mortui pecuniam non accepisses, nec poena eius in te arderet.*

B. The condition is unfulfilled in present or in future time; or the relation is a general one and consequently the time is not specified.

fordæm, gif se weobed ufan hol nære, & ðær wind to come, ðonne tostencte he ða lac. C. P. 217,21. *Si enim in altari fossa non esset, omne, quod in eo sacrificium reperiret, superveniens aura dispergeret.*

Gif he ongunne and anginn hæfde, buton tweon ne mihte he beon Ælmihtig God. Hom. I, 276,18. Gif ealle menn on worulde rice wæron, þonne næfde seo mildheortnyss nænne stede — — Hom. II, 106,4. Nolde ic sweord beran, wæpen to wyrme, gif ic wiste hu wið ðam æglæcam elles meahthe gylpe wið gripan, swa ic gio wið Grendle dyde. Beo. 2578. gif ðu þonne swelces nanwuht næfdest, þonne ne þorfstest ðu ðe nanwuht ondrædan. Cons. cp. 14, § 3, p. 461. with the subj. indic. form.

NOTE.

1. Inversion.

Inversion of the protasis and omission of the conjunction, is more common in these two cases than in any other. It is hardly found however with any form except wære, and then chiefly in late texts.

Ahte ic minca handa geweald, and moste ane tid ute weordan, wes ane winterstunde, þonne ic mid þis werode. — Cæd. Gen. 367. Næron swa manega martyras, nære seo mycele ehtnyss. Saints II, 328. Hom. I, 94,33.

Ealle we scoldan forweorðan ecan deaðe, nære þæt Crist for us deað þrowode. Wulf 111,6. Cons. cp. 35, § 2, p. 1561.

2. Þær as the conditional conjunction.

Þær is well established as a conditional conjunction in this class. I have found no examples for it in Aelfric.

hie wið godes bearne nið ahofun, swa hie no sceoldon, þær hie leahtra fruman larum ne hyrdon. El. 839 (cf. Prollius, p. 21).

Dær we us selfum demden, ðonne ne demde us no God. C. P. 415,7. Þær yfel aht wære, þonne mihte hit God wyrcan. Cons. cp. 35, § 5, p. 164 h. Sio scyld hine suide feorr of ealca haligro rime atuge, ðær him oft ða gesuinc and ða earfeðu ne gehulpen. C. P. 37,9: also 305,18; 355²; 443¹⁷

Cons.: cp. 27, § 3, p. 100h; cp. 35, § 5, p. 164h; cp. 39, § 12, p. 234l (þæt by a misprint); cp. 40, § 5, 240l.

3. Indic in the unfulfilled condition.

A condition universally recognized as contrary to fact may be expressed with the indic, thus heightening the impression of impossibility. Logically such a condition must be classed with the unfulfilled.

Gif ænig man mæg geriman þære eorðan dust, þonne mæg he eac swilce geriman þinne ofspring. Gen. 13, 16 (Wohlfahrt s. 20).

Class V. CONDITIONS INTRODUCED BY BUTON.

Clauses introduced by buton, nefne, or nymde, in the various senses of 'unless', 'except', 'if not' take the subj. We may distinguish two classes.

The protasis is truly exceptive.

A. It makes a reservation from the statement, or recognizes an element which may intrude to prevent the realization of the idea contained in the apodosis. The formula is: a thing will happen, except under certain conditions.

ðonne singallice disse eorðlican drohtunge gewuna wile to weorþan, buton hine sio myndgung dara haligra gewita onbryrde. C. P. 169,6. and geselþ eallne ðonne welan æfter ðam anwealde, buton he hine mid læsan begitan mæge Cons. cp. 33, p. 2, p. 124h. He gives *all* that wealth for power, unless he may get it for less'.

Mycel yfel ded se de leas writ, buton he hit gerihhte. Hom. I, 8,12 & II, 2,22. Ealle we sind gelice ætforan Gode,

buton hwa oderne mid godum weorcum forðeo. Hom. I, 260,24. Buton Drihten ða burh gehealde, on ydel waciad þa hyrdas ðe hi healdad. Hom. II, 230,4.

A curious use of *nemne* in the purely exceptive sense with the pret. subj. is: þa wæs geworden, þætte þære seolfan neahte þa brohton ban ute awunedon, *nemne* mon geteld ofer abraedde. Beda 182,23. Then it came about, that same night the bones which had been brought remained out of doors (*foris*), except (that) they spread an awning overhead.

Sunnan-daga cypinge we forbeodad eac eornostlice and ælc folegemot, buton hit for mycelne nydþearfe sy. Wulf 117,5. Ge sweltað deade, nymde ic dom wite, sodan swefnes, þæs min sefa myndgað. Daniel 143.

The condition is indispensable.

B. An idea denied in the apodosis cannot be realized except through the realization of the idea expressed in the protasis. The apodosis may be formed by a negative sentence or by a rhetorical question requiring a negative answer. The latter form is rare. The formula is: A thing will not happen, except under a certain condition.

ðæt scip wile hwilum stigan ongean ðone stream, ac hit ne maeg. buton ða rowend hit teon, ac hit sceal fleotan mid ðy streame C. P. 445,10. Hu sceal min cuman gæst to geoce, *nemne* ic gode sylle hyrsumne hyge? Guth. 339. Monnan ic ne bite, nymde he me bite. Rid. 66,5. We ne beoð na fulfremede buton we beon afandode. Hom. I, 170,14.

ne bid nan fæsten gode gecweme, buton se man hine sylfne fram leabtrum forhæbbe. Wulf 286,12.

With pret. subj. Ac hit Scipio nolde him aliefan wið nanum oþrum þinge buton hie him ealle hiera wæpeno ageafen 7 þa burg forleten etc. Or. 210,19.

REMARKS.

1. A very few cases occur where the indic. follows buton etc. These were in all probability mistakes or solecisms. I have but one example for the prose.

forþon hiom sænd god on micelne brogan, fyr and hungor, buton bio to godes geleafan ær gecyrran willaþ. Wulf 216,14. A case with nefne: ham cymed, gif he hal leofað, nefne him holm gestyred. Versus Gnomici (Ex) 106.

Two cases from Genesis are probably only apparent exceptions. forhwon wast þu wean, and wrihte sceome — — nymþe þu appel ænne byrgdest of þam wudu beam þe ic þe wordum forbead? Cæd. Gen. 880 (similar is 1401). 'Wherefore knowest thou woe — — except (that) thou tastedst the apple?' There is hardly any conditional force in the nymþe clause. Nymþe is not construed with byrgdest but with the entire clause. It is properly such a construction as is mentioned in the next paragraph and explained elsewhere. Prose would require nymþe þæt, a collocation instanced several times in the Beda.

2. Apparent cases of buton with the indic. where another conjunction or clause follows that conjunction immediately are cases of mixed or double construction and will be considered under the head of contracted clauses. Odde hwæt is ure weordscipe — — buton ðæt we sint gesceapend æfter dære bisene ures Sciþþendes? C. P. 249,16.

3. The few cases where buton is used in an unreal condition, as: forði buton he drowode for us, ne mihte ure nan cuman to Godes rice. Hom II, 20, have been classed with the unreal or unfulfilled condition.

4. There is scarce a trace of conditional force in this example. And næs ænig word, þæt ænig man on hine funde, buton hit wære eall soð, þæt he sæde. Wulf 205,19. where the buton clause is properly rendered. 'There was no word — — which was not entirely true, of that which he said'. or more closely 'no word, but was all true', which would seem to be a survival of the idiom.

5. The Latin fails us with regard to this construction; for in most cases *nisi* conditions are freely paraphrased in Anglo-Saxon and buton conditions are formed from negative conditions or allied constructions in the Latin.

EXPANDED FORMS OF THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE.

It is hardly necessary to state the obvious expansions of the conditional sentence from the type where each member is a simple clause. Either, or both, the protasis and apodosis may consist in a compound clause. Ac gif sio pynding wierð onpennad, oððe sio wering wierð tobrocen, ðonne toflewð hit eall, & ne wierð to nanre nytte, buton to fenne. C. P. 277,8.

An apodosis may be restricted by more than one condition. In this case one is subordinate to the other either in time or importance.

Both conditions have the indic.

gif he yfle deð, læsse wite he ðrowað on helle, gif he ana ðider cymð, ðonne he do, gif he oðerne mid him ðider bringð. C. P. 33,1. gif seo ðonne bið eac fennegu, ðonne is wen ðæt hio ða oðre wiers besmite gif hio hire ahrind. C. P. 75,23+.

Gif se synfulla bið gebrocod for his unrihtwisnysse, þonne gif he mid geðylde his Drihten herað, and his miltsunge bitt, he bið ðonne ađwogen fram his synnum. Hom. I, 472,2.

Gif he rihtwis bið, he hæfd þonne maran gedincðe þurh his brocnunge gif he geðyldig bið. Hom. I, 472,6. Gif ðe man scotad to, þu gescyltst ðe, gif þu hit gesihst. Hom. II, 538, 10. þurh ða fandunge we sceolon gedeon, gif we æfre wiðsacað deofle, and eallum his larum; and gif we genealæcað urum Drithne mid geleafan, and lufu, and godum weorcum. Hom. I, 170,15.

Two conditions one in past the other in present time with the same apodosis. Gif he nu for us arisan ne wolde, micle ma gif we him underþeodde beoð, he us eac for noht gehygeð. Beda 102,18.

Change of "moods to set off a condition from a subordinate one" (Hotz 58) is found rarely. Hotz has been led to emphasize this exceptional construction from the examples in the Laws and in the Legal part of the Old Testament, which hardly correspond to the usage of literary prose.

Possibly the following instance is an example of this change of mood to set off conditions of different grades. Gif hwa gonge bilewitlice mid his friend to wuda treow to ceorfanne, & sie acs awient of ðæm hielfe, & swa ungewealdes ofslieð his geferan, be ðonne sceal fleon. C. P. 165,24. but I prefer with Fleischhauer (p. 26) to interpret the indicatives as caused by a momentary dropping out of the construction into lively

description of the event in mind. The following example seems to show clearly the kind of change of mood described previously. Sæge he, gif he æt leorninga sæte odde elles hwæt dyde, gif seuninga mare blad windes astah (*adsurgeret*), þæt he sona instæpe Drihtnes mildheortnesse gecegeð 7 þa miltse bæd monna cynne. Beda 268,15.

In the following instance the first condition has concessive force; this rendering is confirmed by the þeah in apodosis. gif þu him heodæg wuht hearmes gespræce, he forgyfð hit þeah, gif we him geongordom læstan willad. Cæd. Gen 657.

Two conditions one with gif and the other with buton may be found with the same apodosis. Gif ðu ðe hrador ne gewitst fram Jacobe, and buton ðu wyrige Cristes naman, þu scealt beon beheafod samod mid him. Hom. II, 422,21. Þonne gif he mid deofles weorcum hine sylfne bebint, ðonne ne mæg he mid his agenra mihte hine unbindan, buton se Ælmihtiga God mid strangre handa his mildheortnysses hine unbinde. Hom. I, 212,12. With subjs in both clauses. ac þæt he tæld to unalyfedlicere wiglunge, gif hwa ða wyrta on him becnitte, buton he hi to ðam dolge gelege. Hom. I, 476,4.

V.

THE CONDITION EXPRESSED BY FORMS USUALLY NON-CONDITIONAL.

The innumerable lines of association of ideas in language prevent the perfect crystallization of thought into fixed forms of expression. Grammatical categories mark merely centers of radiation, the fields of which overlap, unite or conflict in ever changing combinations. We expect to find and do find to the main idea of a construction appended or superadded many minor functions, some of them apparently widely different from the original function. No construction affords a better example of the vicissitudes of form and of meaning than the conditional sentence in its many points of contact with other constructions.

A condition is itself subject to, or may even consist in relations of time, manner etc.; so we shall not be surprised to find temporal, and modal clauses etc. which retaining little or much of their primitive force have gone over to an essentially conditional meaning. Such secondary or double constructions are highly interesting in the study of style. I have attempted to classify those that touch upon the conditional sentence in Anglo-Saxon under appropriate rubrics at this place.

"A relative with an indefinite antecedent gives a conditional force to the clause in which it stands, and is called a conditional relative" (Moods & Tenses p. 197).

Such a construction is of course very common. The introducing relative is usually *se ðe* or *swa hwa* (hwylc) *swa*. A few instances of the translation of Latin conditions by a relative, and the reverse will show how interchangeable the constructions are, and that *se ðe* is equal to *si quis*.

Se ðe bisecephade gewilnað, god weorc he gewilnað. C. P. 53,7. *Si quis episcopatum desiderat, bonum opus desiderat.* *se ðe* God no ongit, no ongit God hine. C. P. 29,2. *Si quis autem ignorat, ignorabitur.* *Se ðe* Godes degn sie, ga hider to me etc. C. P. 383,1. *Si quis Domini est, jungatur mihi.* An instance of class II which properly takes the subj. *se ðe* godes cyrican, he (68) cwæð, rype oððe reafige oððe halignessa grið brece, â he forwyrðe. Wulf 67,24+. *Si quis ecclesiam dei denudaverit vel sanctimonia uioluerit, anathema sit.* cf. Ræde *se ðe* wille. Rid 60,16. and *Se ðe* me þenige, fylige he me. Hom. 160,3; Odsace nu . . *se þe* wille oþþe *se þe* dyrrre þæt angin nære gistilled — Or. 206,6. A rather curious use of *þe* representing gif is: Hu *se* Wisdom lærde þone, *þe* he wolde wæstmbereland sawan, þæt he atnhge of ærest þa þornas — — etc. Cons. Tit. cp. 23, p. XIV.

The more usual form is represented by: Hu *se* Wisdom hine lærde, gif he fæst hus timbrian wolde etc. Cons. Tit. cp. 12, p. XII, also *þe* (*si*) C. P. 383,34.

Swa swylc hyse-cild ne bið ymsniden on þam fylmene his flæscas, his sawul losað. Hom. I, 94,12. *de þe* wille

fullice anweald agan, he sceal tilian ærest þæt he hæbbe anweald his agenes moodes. Cons. cp. 29, § 3, 106 m.

Swa hwa swa wille bion disse weorolde freond to ungemetlice, he bið gehaten Godes feond. C. P. 421,34. 357,4. Swa hwa sprece, sprece he Godes worde swelce ða word no his ne sien, ac Godes C. P. 371,15. *Si quis loquitur, quasi sermones Dei.* þonecan þe seems to mean 'nevertheless if' in the following case: Twa ðing mæg se weorþscipe 7 se anweald gedon, gif he becymþ to þam dysigan. He mæg hine gedon weorþne 7 andryse oþrum dysgum. Ac þonecan þe he þone anweald forlæt, oððe se anweald hine, þonne ne biþ he nauþer þam dysegan ne weorþ ne andrysne. Cons. cp. 27, § 1, p. 94 m.

A few instances of translation of a Latin relative by gif.

Hwæt se ðonne unryhtlice talað, se ðe talað ðæt he sie unscyldig, gif he ða good, ðe us God to gemanan sealde, him synderlice ægnað. C. P. 335,11. — *qui communc Dei munus sibi privatum vindicant.* for ðæm nan mon ne bitt oðerre ðæt he hine rære, gif he self nat ðæt he afeallen bið; ne eac se, se his wunde sar ne gefret, ne wilnað he nanes læres. C. P. 441,9. departs from the Latin in the first instance and follows it in the second. *quia nec levare appetit, qui et hoc ipsum, quia cecidit, nescit, et qui dolorem vulncris non sentit, salutatis remedia non requirit.*

2.

TEMPORAL CONDITION.

Temporal conjunctions nu, þonne, ær are used to introduce conditional clauses.

a) nu.

Nu (*si autem*) he þara læssena rica reccend is, hu micle swidor wene we þæt he ofer þa maran sie Cr. 58,25. Hwa mæg ðonne for dyllecum bion gehealden, buton miclum

geswince & miclum plio, nu se on dæm rice on swelce synne befioll, se de God self to þæm rice geceas? C. P. 393,10 *Quis — — saluabitur, si ille in his culpa interueniente turbatus est, qui ad hæc fuerat Deo elegente preparatus.* cf. C. P. 393, 8,10; 383,16 and 377,21, the latter possibly rather causal than conditional.

Ono nu is found in Beda. Probably nu is the conditional conjunction and we may accept Miller's statement, XXXI, "It is clear from the table that ono never means 'if', though Bede has been quoted in support of this sense"

Ono nu nu þæm mete ne bið clæne, þam þæt mod ne bið clæne, forhwon þonne þæt wiif þæt heo clæne mode of gecynd þrowað, sceal hire in unclænesse geteled beon? Beda 80,19. *Si ergo ei cibus immundus non est — — cur — — ei in immunditiam reputetur.* So. Beda 78,14, 27; 84,6.

Nu (si) alone. Beda 234,29. Eornostlice nu ge þe yfle synt, cunnau gode sylena eowrum bearnum syllan, mycle ma eower Fæder — — syleð god þam de hyne biddað Mat. 7,11. *Si ergo vos — — nosti — dare.* (R has nu nu þonne.) Nu follows the subject, an unusual order. Ac we nu hæfdon ænigne dæt untriogendes andgites swa swa englas habbad, þonne mihte we ongiton þæt þæt andgit biþ micle betere donne ure gesceadwisnesse Cons. cp. 41, § 5, p. 254 h. *Si igitur uti rationis participes sumus, ita — — iudicium — — habere possimus.* I have not found a conditional nu in Aelfric or in Wulfstan.

b) þonne used of indefinite time may introduce a condition in the sense of 'if ever' or even with slighter temporal force 'in case that'.

donne ahebbad ða synfullan swide uþ hira hornas, donne hi hi næfre nyllad geeaðmedan to dæm dæt hie ongieten hira unryhtwisnesse, & ða hreowsian. C. P. 425,23. *Cornu quippe*

delinquentes exaltant, si nequaquam se ad poenitentiam ex cognitione suae iniquitatis humiliant. C. P. 265,4. Witodlice ne bid he þæra æhta deowa, þonne he hi dælan ne mæg; ac he bid þæra æhta blaford, þonne he him eallunga þeowad. Hom. I, 66,5. Hwæt fremad him þæt þæt he hæfd, þonne he done (God) næfd þe him da god forgeaf, þe he hæfd? Hom. II, 410,22. These examples will suffice. Such temporal conditions are common enough in all texts. It is difficult to distinguish sharply between purely temporal and temporal-conditional sentences in this case.

c) þonne in a conditional sense may introduce a clause which expresses the concrete duty or phase of conduct that corresponds to a biblical type. This construction is tediously common in C. P. It was rather a favorite way of preaching, — and its end is not yet — this often far-fetched interpretation of all biblical circumstances as types. A page of such conditions may be found from C. P. 161,10.

donne hie stondað up on dæm munte, donne dæt flæsc nauht elles ne secd to dæm odrum buton tudor. C. P. 399,4. Eft, donne we his menniscnysse mid lule underfod, þonne ete we þæs lambes fet. Hom. II, 280,11.

The following passage from Aelfric shows that gif and þonne were interchangeable in this case.

Buccan we offriað, odde ticcen, gif we ures lichaman galnysse oferswydað. Culfran we offriað, gif we soðe bile-witnysse on urum mode healdað. Turtlan we offriað, gif we on clænnysse wuniað þeorfa blafas we bringað Gode to lace, donne we buton yfelnyssse (212) beorman on deorfnyssse syfernyssse and soð fæstnyssse farað. Hom. II, 210,31+.

d) Aer may be used to introduce a temporal condition in nearly the sense of buton. (cf. Fleischhauer 85).

dæt mod dætte ne mæg gesion da flane ær hit sie ge-

wundad, hit beðearf ðæt hit hæbbe simle on honda ðone scield Godes eges. C. P. 431,3. so 331,21; 445,2.

e) Mid dy as a temporal condition, translating cum, may be noted here. Mid þy þonne seo lufu ne bið tudres to tilieune, ac se willa ma wealded in þam weorc þære gemengnisse, þonne habbad þa gesinhiwan ðearfe be heora gemengdnesse, þæt hi wepen 7 hreowe don. Beda 82,25; so 86,14. Wið þam: se deofol befran — — — gif he wolde on hine gelyfan, — — — wið þam þe he gefremode his fulan galnysse. Saints III, 368.

3. CONDITIONAL SUBJECT CLAUSES.

A subject clause, introducing a purely hypothetical or unreal idea, may be in a truly conditional relation to the verb of which it is the logical subject. The introducing conjunction is þæt and the verb is always subj. There is often a comparative in the independent clause. Se ðe ænige ðissa ierminga besuicð, him wære betere ðæt him wære suma esuleweorn to ðam suiran getiged, and sua aworpen to sæs grunde. C. P. 31,2. In the Gospels: nyttre him wære þæt an cweorn-stan sy gecnytt abutan his swiran 7 si on sæ be-worpen ðonne he gedrefe ænne of þissum lytlingum. Lk. 17,2. *utillius est illi si lapis maloris imponatur circa collum eius et projicatur in mare, quam etc.* þæt him wære ealra mæst unsælp, þæt þæt se fyrst wære oð domes dæg. Cons. cp. 38, § 4, p. 204 m *infelicissimam vero, si esset. æterna.*

Forþam sume menn wenap þæt þæt sie seo seleste gesælp, þæt mon sie swa selig þæt he manes þinges maran ne þurfe Cons. cp. 24, § 2, p. 82 h. Him wære swa-ðeah betere þæt he forburne þonne he ætburste. Hom. II, 480,8; 244,5. also C. P. 31,23; 33,29; 433,29; (cf. Fleischhauer 6—7).

4) þær with the pret. subj. has been classed with the unfulfilled condition.

Fleischhauer (p. 27) regards the following construction with *ðær* as wholly temporal. Its antithesis with the concessive clause, — Fleischhauer has stopped his citation at *idelu*, — certainly marks it as a temporal condition, similar to those with *þonne*. *Sua eac ðær ðæt heafod bið unhal, eall ða limu bioð idelu, deah hie hal sien.* C. P. 129,7.

5.

CONCESSIVE CONDITION.

þeah in a conditional rather than a concessive force is instanced rarely.

ga to þinum huse 7 ðeah þu on tun ga, nænegum þu hit ne sege. Mk. 7,26. *Vade in domum tuam, et si in vicum introiens, nemini dixeris.* There is no true adversative sense in *ðeah* or *et si*, they simply have the force of 'if' and mark a somewhat remote condition. The glosses R & L translate by *gif*.

Is *þæt hwelc wundor, þeah ðe he þone dæg his deaðes oðþe ma þone Drihtnes dæg bliðe gesege, þone he symle sorgende bad, oð þæt he cwome?* Beda 268,6. *non autem mirum, si diem mortis uel potius diem domini lætus aspexit, quem semper, usquedum ueniret, sollicitus expectare curauit.*

þeah ðe israhelitisc folc beo swa mænig fyld, swa swa sandcysel, þe lid on sæstrande, þæt þe þonne to lafe bið, hit bið gehealden Wulfstan 198,21. si fuerit numerus filiorum Israhel, sicut arena maris, reliquie salve fient. Nis bit nan wundor *ðeah hwa (si credatur) wene etc.* Cons. cp. 39, § 2, p. 214h.

The modal conjunctions *swa* and *swylce* (*swa swa*) may introduce a conditional clause.

a) *swa* or *swa swa* in the sense of 'provided that' is extremely rare in Anglo-Saxon. For examples of 'so' as conditional in Mid. and Mod. Eng. cf Mätzner III, 484. He has no examples for A. S. The following examples are all that I have been able to find.

Swa swa sio nafu bið simle swa gesund, hnæppen ða felga on þæt ðe hi hnæppen. Cons. cp. 39, § 7, p. 2221.

Ic gelyfe to þe, min liffruma, þæt þu mildheort me næfre wille an forlæten, swa ic þæt gefremme, þenden feorh leofað, min on moldan, þæt ic þinum larum leofwendum lyt geswice Andr. 1290 (Reyssner p. 21). From Bosworth-Toller I cite: *He him ðet land forbeað, swa he æniges brucan wolde.* Charters (Thorpe) 202,10. *Nim, swa hit ðe ne mislicyge.* Apol. of Tyre (Thorpe) 20,12. To which I may add doubtfully, *he þe mæg soð gecyðan, onwrecan wyrða geryno, swa þu hine wordum frignest, ariht from orde oð ende forð.* El. 587.

b) *Swylce* (*swa swa* and *swa*) in the sense of 'as if' usually takes the subj.

We have here it would seem a double, or compressed construction at once modal and conditional; and *swylce* is to be resolved into 'as it would be if' —. Such modal conditions are unreal or purely hypothetical.

Swelce he openlice cuæde. C. P. 71,12 (*ac si aperte dicat*) so 465, 20 and 35. *Hu ne bið he ðonne swelce he sæwe good, & him weaxe of ðæm ælc yfel?* C. P. 341,6. *Hwi mnrenast þu wið min, swilce þu for minum ðingum seo dines agnes benumen.* Cons. cp. 7, § 3, p. 20h.

his freonde forspæc forstent him eal þæt sylfe, swylce hit sylf spæce. Wulf 38,16. so 301,12. Also Wulf 53, ll 3,

8, 18, 25. swa swa. Eft heo, swa swa heo leohtlice gebylged wære, æfter þon heo cwæð. Beda 290,18. „*quasi leuiter indignata*. So Beda 122,15; 174,29.

swa þa wæs he meted swa unsceded, swa he in þa ilcan tid of þissum leohte gelæded wære. Beda 218,25.

Swyle swa. þis andwearde lif — — — is swyle swa þu æt swæsendum sitte Beda 134,26. Ca. reads. swa gelic swa.

In the case swelce ðu woldest ða lean eallra þinra godena weorca on þisse worulde habban. Cons. ep. 7, § 3, p. 22 m. Woldest is probably the common subj. indic. form.

To my feeling the modal idea is much stronger than the conditional in such sentences, and the construction is often merely a less vivid way of expressing a comparison. Still it approaches the condition near enough to be noted in this connection.

7.

DATIVE ABSOLUTE.

A Dative absolute is found only twice as a protasis. The construction is surely not native.

þæt wif he onfeng fram hyra ylðrum þære arednesse, (*ea conditione*) þæt bio his leofnesse hæfde þæt heo þonne þeaw þæs Cristenan geleofan — — healdan moste. Beda 58,13.

The dative absolute is elucidated by a condition introduced by ðær. ða gefæfodon he ðære arednesse 7 him wif sealdon, þæt ðær seo wise on tweon cyme, þæt hi donne ma of þam wif cynne him cyning curan þonne of þam wæpnedcynne. Beda 28,19. *ea solum conditione* — — *ut* etc.

8.

PHRASE WITH BUTON.

Buton as a preposition, 'without', with a relative is equal to a protasis for a conditional sentence.

Seceað siþbe & god to eallum mannum buton ðære ne mæg nan man God gesion. C. P. 345,15. *sine qua nemo videbit Deum*. Geleafa is ealra mægena fyrrest; buton þam, ne mæg nan man gode lician. Hom. I, 134,2. The buton phrase in each instance is equal to a clause: If a man be without these he may not etc. So Hom. II 526,6.

A similar use of a buton phrase as a condition is: forðon þe nan wyrhta ne mæg god weorc wyrcean for Gode buton lufon & geleafan. Blick 111,14.

Ne mæge ge nan ðing don butan me. Hom. I, 310,18. Butan þam æhtum, gelice sind þa ðær biddað, and ða ðe hi ætbiddað. Hom. I, 256,4.

9. TWO SENTENCES AS MEMBERS OF A CONDITIONAL PERIOD.

A sentence may state the condition for a following sentence and so form a protasis. This has been illustrated already for imperative sentences.

Aerest hi sculon ongietan ðæt hi fleon ðæt ðæt hi lufiað. ðonne magon hi sið iedlice ongietan ðæt ðæt is to lufianne ðæt hi ær flugon. C. P. 441, 13.

VI.

CONTRACTED AND ELLIPTICAL CLAUSES.

Anglo-Saxon as it has come down to us is rather an inflexible language and little tolerant of contraction and ellipsis. Middle and Modern English offer a marked contrast in this respect. Outside of the exceptive clause with *buton* (*nemne*) we shall find little contraction and only the most obvious ellipses; in most cases where the immediate context supplies the exact form of the missing member.

CONTRACTION.

A contracted clause is one that lacks a member, usually the verb, which must be supplied from the context or otherwise.

CONTRACTION OF BUTON CLAUSES.

Contraction of a protasis with *buton* (*nemne*) is very common, by the omission of a verb.

The verb of the apodosis is to be carried over to the protasis. *Forþon ne sceal biscopa halgung on odre wisan wesan, nemne in gesomnung 7 in gewitscipe þreora oðþe feower biscopa.* Beda 72,16. *Se feorda is: þætte munecas ne leoren of stowe to oderre, ne of mynster to oðrum, nemne*

þurh leafnesse his agnes abbudes Beda 278,13. 'unless he go by his own abbots leave'. Hwæt gelyff se lichama butan þurh þa sawle? Blick 21,21. ne nænig his agen wiif forlæte, nemne swa þæt halig godspell læred, for intingan dyrne forlegenesse. Beda 280,1. *Nullus coniugem propriam nisi, ut sanctum evangelium docet, fornicationis causa, relinquat.* The Latin seems to show that the swa clause is parenthetical and that nemne is construed with the phrase and not with the clause. Forþon we witon swiþe lytel þæs þe ær us wæs, buton be gemynde Cons. cp. 42,2561. Hwæt is þæt rice þæt he betæcð his Fæder, buton da halgan, menn, etc. Hom. I 264,9.

Buton (nemne) is followed immediately by a clause subject, relative, temporal, causal, or modal, with clauses have the mood appropriate to themselves invidually. We seem to have compressed into the one word buton the idea of a clause upon which the following clause is in different relations subordinate. The complete logical expression is "Unless it be, 'that' —, 'he who' —, 'when' —, 'because' —, 'as' —. As in the preceding case the verb for the buton clause is often to be supplied or carried over from the apod. We have in such cases then contracted, complex clauses. It is quite unnecessary to suppose that these forms arose historically, within Anglo-Saxon, from completely expressed complex clauses. The contraction may well enough have been coincident with the formation of such complex clauses. That these are certainly logically contracted clauses, and that buton þæt etc. is not a mere formula introducing the whole clause is proved by the fact that such clauses have generally the indic., while buton requires the subj.

Subject clause. Oððe hwæt is ure weordscipe — — buton dæt we sint gesceapene æfter dære bisene ures Scippen-

des? C. P. 249,16. Se wære wierde ealre Romana onwaldes for his monigfealdum dugudum, buton þæt he þa wiþ his hlaford won for oðra monna lare. Or. 292,15.

Relative clause Hwædres ðonne ðara yfela is betere ær to tilianne, buton swædres swæder frecenlicre is? C. P. 457,21. Non man ne astihð to heofonum, buton se ðe of heofonum astah. Hom. II 378,1.

Temporal clause. & ðeah ne bið na gemengde, buton ðonne hi wilniað bearn to gestrienne. C. P. 399,3.

Causal clause. Forhwy bið se synfulla onbryrd mid ðære breowsunga — — buton forðy ðe ðæm synfullan nauht ne helpað his godan gedohtas. C. P. 423,22. buton forðæm ðæt — C. P. 397,8.

Clause of purpose with subj. ne gæð na mare to metinge buton þæt þu hit geseo and herige. Hom. I, 186,6.

Very rarely buton and þæt are separated by the verb. Ac hwonon wurde þu mid þissum woruld sorgum þus swiþe geswenced, buton, ic wat, þæt þu hæst ðara wæpna to hraþe forgiten ðe ic þe ær sealde. Cons. cp. 3, § 1, p. 4m.

Contraction of Clauses which normally require gif is rare.

Even the carrying over of gif from a preceding clause, as instanced in the following example, is rare.

Forþæm gif hit swa nære, þonne nære he þæt þæt he gehaten is, oþþe ænig þing ærwære, oþþe æltæwre, ðonne wære þæt betere ðonne he. Cons. cp. 34, § 2, 136 h.

THE CONDITION EXPRESSING PURPOSE.

A peculiar construction which expresses purpose with a conditional restriction is found in Anglo-Saxon. With regard to its survival in biblical English I can do no better than to quote Goodwin's 'Moods and Tenses' p. 180, Note 1. "The English translation of certain conditional clauses in the New

Testament which have this peculiar construction preserves the sense of purpose or desire with the original form of protasis. Thus, 'that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him' Acts XVII, 27; and 'he came (to the fig tree) if haply he might find anything thereon' Mark XI, 13". ἤλθεν εἰ ἄρα τι εὕρησαι ἐν αὐτῇ. The following citations will show that the construction was already established in an early period of Anglo-Saxon.

Cuomon hio to Ealdseaxna mægde, gif wen wære þæt he þær ænige þurh heora lare Criste begytan mihte. Beda 414,17. *Uenerunt ad prouinciam Antiquorum Saxonum. si forte aliquos — — Christo adquirere possent.* Similarly with *si forte*. Beda 408,25; 366,27. ða ahof hine up 7 ongan aweg gan, gif he hƿær (*sicubi*) ænigne freond metan meahte, — — Beda 326,11. Similar is, 7 þæt he wæs lædende in stowe halges gebedes, gif he ðam untruman broðrum — — — ful-tum sealde (*tribueret*) Beda 370,4, 326,11. gif is equivalent to þylæs: breac ealde healsnng, gif hie hwylenedrycræft hæfden þæt hie hine oferswidan 7 beswican sceolden. Beda 58,21.

ELLIPTICAL CONSTRUCTIONS.

In these cases a complete clause must be supplied from the context to complete the sense of the conditional sentence. Ellipsis is practically always of the apodosis; for an apodosis is grammatically complete by itself and suggests no other member. This ellipsis is very rare.

FORMULAS OF ADDRESS.

Gif þu þonne dæt gemet habban wille 7 þa nydþearfe witan wille, þonne is þæt mete 7 drync — — þæt þe is

Gecynde. Cons. cp. 14, § 1, p. 42h. some such apodosis as 'know that', 'I tell you', 'you may learn' or the like is to be supplied, upon which the apparent apodosis depends. The following instances, cited in another connection, and which appear to fall under this head are possibly rhetorical questions as in the Latin original rather than rhetorical conditions. The difference in meaning is slight, but if the clauses stand in the relation of question and answer it is unnecessary to assume ellipsis. The Latin favors this interpretation, the þonne repeated through the clauses the other.

A friue hie mon þonne æfter hu monegum wintrum sio sibb gewurde -- --: þonne is þæt æfter L wintra 7 feower hundum. Ahsige þonne eft hu longe sio sibb gestode; þonne wæs þæt an gear. Cr. 182,16. *Et hoc post quantum temporis? post annos quadringentas et quadraginta. Quando? Anno uno.*

INTRODUCED BY ODÐE OR ELLES.

Odðe or elles introducing a clause, which is not a mere alternative, are equivalent logically to a negative protasis formed from the immediately preceding statement. They are often used to introduce a clause expressing the result of the non-fulfilment of a command.

Geoffra ðine lac urum godum, odðe þu bist mid eallum dissum pinung-tolum getintregod. Hom. I, 424,21, 426,6.

And forði ic sprece ðe he me het, elles ic ne dorste on his andwerdnyse spreca. Hom. I 462,31 ; II 310,6. C. P. 455,12.

The full expression of the condition which is always implied in these words is found in the following instance.

Gif hit hwæt elles bið, ic brædlice mid Godes willan eft to eow hweorfe. Beda 366,6.

MISCELLANEOUS INSTANCES.

The proper apodoses are always easily supplied from the context.

Symle ge habbað þearfan (to whom you may do good), gif ge willað teala don, ac ge nabbað me symle. Blick 69,16.

Gif þu wilt ongeotan & geþenecan hu mycel hine be-leah þæt he losode (you will see), þe leas he me yfel sacode wid God. Blick 189,23.

With an interrupted construction. Huru gif he cwæde þæt he nære sumum oðrum mannum gelic — ac he cwæd etc. Hom. II,428,21. So C. P. 25,21.

A PROTASIS IN PRESENT TIME WITH AN APODOSIS IN PAST TIME.

Such a conditional period is strictly illogical and we must always assume a mental change of the time of the apodosis; practically the formation of a new apodosis describing a continuous action in present time.

þæt wæs siþþan Crist geboren wæs þæt we wæron of ælcum þeowdome aliesde 7 of ælcum ege, (and are released) gif we him fulgongan willað. Or. 214,22. So, þisne anweald forgeaf Crist þam apostolum and eallum bisceopum, (and grants it) gif hi hit on riht healdad. Hom. I, 232,33. So Hom. I, 22,25.

VII.

THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN INDIRECT DISCOURSE AND SUBORDINATE POSITION.

An apodosis may consist of a subordinate clause with the verb in the tense and mood appropriate to the construction. This may induce a change in the tense and mood of the verb of the protasis. When the apodosis is the object complement of a verb of saying or thinking, it is said to be in indirect discourse. Further a subject clause or the various sorts of adverbial clauses may form apodoses in a conditional sentence. Special studies of indirect discourse and of the adverbial clauses are much to be desired. At this point I can only classify such conditional sentences according to the nature of their apodoses, exhibit the uses of mood and of tense in such constructions, and present the material for several important texts.

The temporal and causal constructions, since they induce no change of mood in the conditional sentence have been disregarded at this point and included under the general classification.

It will be noticed that in dependent constructions in present time there is a tendency to isolate the conditional clause, the verb of which often remains as in direct discourse, unaffected by the change of mood in the apodosis.

A. THE APODOSIS IS DEPENDENT UPON A VERB IN
PRESENT TIME.

1) Indirect discourse.

The apodosis is the object complement of a verb of saying or thinking, and is usually introduced by *þæt*.

- a) Pres. indic. in both protasis and apodosis. This unaltered form of the conditional sentence is frequent.

Nu is eow gesæd — — *þæt ge sind gebroðra, gif ge ðone bend healdað soðre broder-rædene untobrocenne. Hom. II, 318,4. Ic wene þæt þas word ne sind eow full cude, gif we hi openlicor eow ne onwreod. Hom. I, 588,26 & 528,21. C. P. 145¹; 377¹; 397¹⁰; 383²⁸ Cons. cp. 7, § 2, p. 181. Blick 21,7; 89,15; 181,32.*

The apodosis may be introduced by *hu*, *hwelc*, or *hwæder*. *ðærbufan is geteald hwelc he beon sceal, gif he untælwierde bið. C. P. 53,10. C. P. 57,14 (hwæder); 161,15 & 315,15 (hu). Cons. cp. 27, § 2, p. 96 h and cp. 30, § 1, p. 108 m (hu). Hom. II, 98,14; 282,28.*

With a *buton* clause as apodosis. *Ac wite gehwa to gewissan, buton he his flæsclican lustus and galnysse gewanige, þæt he ne hylt his cristendom mid rihtum bigenge. Hom. I, 96,2.*

- b) The verb of the apodosis is pres. subj. that of the protasis pres. indic.

Hom. II, 344,33. We gelyfað þæt he mæge beon gehealden, gif he his synna mid wope behreowsiað, and be lareowa tæcnunge hi gebet. Hom. I, 292,23. I, 124,14; 268,34. II, 146,34; 316,27; 344,33; 423,30. C. P. 425,1 (hwæder).

fordæm he wenþ þæt he hie þonne ealle hæbbe, gif he hæfd þæt þæt he swipast wilnaþ to begitanne. Cons. cp. 24, § 4, p. 86 h.

A buton condition which as always has the subj. in protasis. Hom. I, 26,17. Cons. cp. 41, § 2, p. 244 m.

c) The pres. subj. is found in both clauses.

wenþ, gif he ðonne lust begite 7 þæt þurhtio, þæt he ðonne getihhod hæfd, þæt he þonne hæbbe fulle gesælþa. Cons. cp. 34, § 2, p. 144 h.

nu ne willað reccan, gif he ðær suelc to cyme, hu he ðæron libban scyle C. P. 73,22. Ac gesaga me hwylce mede þu wille syllan þam men, gif hwile sy etc. Beda 128,25.

The apodosis is dependent upon a verb of promising wishing fearing etc.

The verb of the apod. is subj., that of the prot. indic.

— -- hie magon ondrædon ðæt him weorden ða wyrtruman færcorfe on ðys andweardan life, gif hie for hiera giemeliste nyllað beran ða bleða godra weorca C. P. 339,19.

The apodosis is a subject clause.

With impersonal constructions.

a) The indic. is found in both clauses.

Oft eac gebyred ðæm ðe him ægðer ðissa ondrædað, gif he wið ægðer gehealdað, ðæt he befeallað on idel gielp. C. P. 457,18.

After the substantive verb and an inflected infinitive, C. P. 201,15; 231,4; 233,16; 301,1.

Hom. I, 48,33. II, 278,1.

b) The verb of the apodosis only is subj.

Be ðam is to smeagenne hu micclum se rihtwisa mid eadmodre heofunge God gegladige, gif se unriht-

wisa mid soðre dædbote hine gegladian mæg. Hom. I, 342,13. C. P. 313,21.

c) The verbs of both clauses are in the pres. subj.

and eow ðincþ þeah þæt ge hæbban ece are, gif ge mægen on eallre eorþene worulde geearnian þæt ge habban godne hlisan æfter eowrum dagum. Cons. 17, § 3, p. 66 h. Beda 134,20; 190,25.

A condition of the form noted in Class IB, 2 appears as a subject clause with the pres. subj. in apodosis and the pret. subj. in protasis. Oðer is þæt hwa rice beo, gif his ylðrau him æhta becwædon, oðer is, gif hwa þurh gytsunge rice gewurðe. Hom. I, 256,20. Class IB 1 with pres. subj. in apodosis. C. P. 57,22.

Two instances of appositive or supplementary clauses as apodoses may be included at this point.

With pres. subjs. in both clauses. Þreo hund biscopa — — ge-ætton ðone canon, þæt nan mæsse preost — — on his wununge wif-hades man næbbe, buton hit sy his modor, oððe sweastor etc. — —: and gif he dearnunga oððe eawunge wifes bruce, þæt he his hades ðolige. Hom. II, 94,29.

Pres. subj. in apodosis pres. indic. in protasis.

Micel mildheortnys þæs Metodan Drihtnes, þæt we beon gecigede swa gesæliglice ures Scyppendes frynd, gif we his hæse gefyllað etc. Hom. II, 316,21.

Here should perhaps be classed the construction in which the apodosis appears as the complement of a passive verb which has already an apparent subject. The logical and grammatical relations of this construction can hardly be satisfactorily defined; and I class it here because of its obvious nearness to the impersonal construction with a dative, in which the apodosis is the logical subject of the impersonal verb (cf. the citation under b).

The construction appears in C. P. only after the inflected infinitive to manienne, and the subj. appears in both clauses of the conditional period.

Fordæm hi sint to manigenne, gif hie ða halwendan forhæfednesse gehabban ne mægen, & — — — — — ðæt hie wilnigen ðære hyde dæs gesinscipes C. P. 401,31; so 263,14; 275,1; 349,18.

The apodosis is a clause of purpose.

Both clauses have the pres. subj.

we þæs sculon hycgan georne, þæt we on Adame, gif we æfre mægen, and on his eafrum swa some andan gebetan Cæd Gen. 396. The verb of the apodosis is subj. that of the protasis indic.

Negative clause of purpose: dylæs him ðy wirs sie, gif hie ða trumnesse ðære Godes giefte him to unnyte hweorfað. C. P. 247,4.

Both clauses have the subj.

dylæs he finde ða duru betynede ongean hine, ðonne he cume, gif he cume idelende to, & ða mid him ne brenge etc. C. P. 379,20. Beda 76,25.

In the following clause of purpose sceolde seems to have lost all sense of a past tense and to have merely modal force.

þæt man Godes ðeow ne sceolde on him sylfum truwian, ne mid wæpnum winnan wið woruldlicum cempum, gif he Cristes fotswadum filigan wile. Hom. II, 248,6.

The apodosis is a consecutive clause.

The verb of the apodosis pres. subj. that of the protasis is pres. indic.

Se ðonne bið siwenige se ðe his &git bið to ðon beorht scinende, ðæt he mæge ongietan soðfæstnesse, gif hit ðonne adistriað ða flæschican weorc. C. P. 67,24. Cons. cp. 40, § 1, p. 201.

Ideal and unreal conditions dependent upon a verb in pres. time. retain their usual form with the pret. subj. in both clauses.

Hwæt ge witon þæt ge giet todæge wæron Somnitum þeowe, gif ge him ne alugen iowra wedd 7 eowre aþas. Or. 122,11. C. P. 51,11; 187,2; 306,2; 311,13. Hom. I, 216,5.

B. THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE DEPENDENT UPON A VERB IN THE PRETERITE.

Weak verbs show almost invariably ambiguous forms. Unambiguous forms are almost without exception in the pret. subj. Apparent violations of the rule of sequence of tenses have been treated in Section VI under the head of ellipsis.

1) Indirect discourse.

a) Pret. subjs. are found regularly in both clauses. sæde, gif he hine underbæc besawe, þæt he sceolde forlætan þæt wif. Cons. cp. 35, § 6, p. 170h.

sæde þæt hit þæm cyninge læsse edwit wære, gif þæm folce buton him þagiet misspeowe, swa him ær dyde. Or. 82,33 &c. 194,10. C. P. 93,8; 355,18; 405,16. Beda 52,21 (buton); 56,20; 98,3; 102,21; 120,21; 134,4; 170,28; 374,25; 396,24; 416,17. dohte gif he hi ealle ofsloge, þæt se an ne ætburste þe he sohte. Hom. I, 82,12. Hom. Vol. I, 16,35; 62,2; 82,18; 108,7,8; 124,26; 178,7; 226,1. Vol. II: 178,23; 246,25; 252,7; 304,19; 478,28; 538,7; 576,1.

Indirect questions. ascedon, gif he feohtan ne dorsten, hwider hie fleon wolden. Or. 54,1. Hom. II, 242,16.

Cases of virtual indirect discourse with no verb of saying expressed are found.

Gif þonne hywlc wif to dam unspedig wære þæt heo das ðing begytan ne mihte, þonne sceolde heo bringan twegen culfran briddas, odðe twa turtlan. Hom. I, 140,2; also 134,16; 196,10. Vol. II, 58,33.

b) A few instances of pret. indic. are found.

þyder he cwæð þæt man miht geseġlian on anum monde, gyf man on niht wicode etc. Or. (Othere) 19,12. bodode, þæt him wæs Godes grama onsigende, gif hi to Gode bugan noldon. Hom. I, 246,16.

An instance probably unique in which the verb of the protasis is pret. indic. while that of the apodosis is pret. subj. This difference of moods common in the pres. was avoided in the pret. ic dohte þæt hit wære læssa ædryt to gehyrenne, gif man ða ane boc ræt on anes geares ymbryne, and ða oðre on ðam æftran geare. Hom. II, 2,10.

In the following instance the construction changes from pret. subj. to pret. indic. in the clauses more remote from the governing verb, which retain the form of direct discourse. It is a good example of the tendency to isolate all clauses not immediately dependent upon the verb.

Swa swa mon on eald spellum seġþ, þæt an nædre wære de hæfde nigan heafdu 7 simle, gif mon anra hwilc ofsloh, þonne weoxon þæs siofon of þæm anum heafde. Cons. cp. 39, § 4, p. 216m. Some what similarly. Beda 268,15. where the second condition has the pret. indic. (cf. Section IV final note).

Pres. subjs. depend upon a verb in the pret.

ðe we ær bufan cwædon, ðæt he ðonne to foo, gif he niede sciele. C. P. 59,9. Mat. 22,24.

The verb of the apodosis is pres. subj., that of the protasis pres. indic. Moyses wrat, gif hwæs broðor dead bið 7 læfd his wif 7 næfd nan bearn, þæt his broðor nime his wif etc. Mk. 12,19. A version of the same sentence in which both subj. and indic. appear in the compound protasis. wrat, gif hwæs broðor byð dead 7 wif hæbbe 7 se byð butan bearnum, þæt his broðor nime his wif etc. Luke 20,28.

The apodosis is dependent upon verbs of commanding, promising, wishing, fearing etc. Pret. subs. in both clauses. This construction is nearly allied to indirect discourse.

forþan þe hie ondredon, gif hie hwilum ne wunnen, þæt hie to rape aslawoden 7 æeargodon. Or. 212,18.

bebead — — gif hwa hit forsoce, þæt he sceolde beon forbærned on hatum ofne. Hom. II, 18,25. Or. 266,10. C. P. 65,1. Hom. I, 124,5. Vol. II, 40,13. gehet — — þæt he wolde Cristes deowdom geceosan, gif he him lif 7 sige forgefe on þæm gewinne, etc. Beda 122,34. Beda 126,10; 234,31; 242,33; 306,24; 308,19; 328,19; 332,11; 344,26; 380,1; 390,19.

An infinitive following a verb of commanding represents an apodosis, the verb of the apodosis is pret. subj. het him ceowan (512) mid scearpum toðum his liðegan fingras, gif him alyfed wære. Hom. II, 512,1.

The apodosis is a subject clause. Pret. subj. in both clauses. wæs cweden — — þætte, gif heo fram wifum clæne wæren, þæt heo moston onfon 7 picgan þa foresetenesse blafas. Beda 84,14. C. P. 93,8; 459,22. Hit wæs swa gewunelic on ealdum dagum þæt gif hwæm sum færlīc sar become, þæt he his reaf totære. Hom. II, 454,13. Vol. I, 6,34; 40,34; Vol. II, 100,32; 166,32.

The following instance of a supplementary clause as a protasis may be inserted. Pret. subs. are found in both clauses. 7 gewearð ða senatos him betweonum, gif hie mon þridðan siþe oferwunne, þæt mon ealle (Cartania) towurpe. Or. 210,5.

The apodosis is a clause of purpose.

swa þæt he mehte ægþerne geræcan, gif hie ænigne feld secan wolden. Chron. p. 90,10. Chron. E 218,11. sealde þæt betste hors — — þæm biscope — — — dæt he hwæðre

on þæm meahhte fordas oferridan, odþe gif hwylc ned gelumpe, þæt he hrædlicor feran scolde. Beda 196,6. So. Beda 122,3,11; 264,32. C. P. 397,19. Hom. I, 80,7.

An action in past time may have as its end a continuous purpose, which is properly expressed by the present tense following a preterite. An instance with the subj. in apod. and the indic. in prot. is. Se Godes Sunn wæs on his gesthuse genyrwed, þæt he us rume wununge on heofonan rice forgife, gif we his wille gehyrsumiað. Hom. I, 36,1.

The apodosis is a consecutive clause or a clause of result.

He teohhode gif hwæt gesyngoden (-en from Cott ms) on þæm frydome, þæt hi hit eft on ðam freodome mid hreowsunge gebeton, 7 gif hiora hwile swa heardheort wære þæt he nane hreowsunge ne dyde, þæt he þonne hæfde rihtlic wite. Cons. 41, § 3, p. 248 m. Beda 228,18; 274,29; 316,21; 328,34. Hom. I, 406,21.

With the pret. indic. in apodosis pret. subj. in protasis.

to ðon þætte Ecgfrid se cyning him geheht ge lond ge micel feoh to gesyllenne, gif he ða cwene gesponan 7 gelæran meahhte, þæt heo brucan his gesynscypes. Beda 316,21.

VIII.

CLAUSE ORDER AND WORD ORDER.

The elaborate study of word position in Anglo-Saxon which Mr. C. A. Smith of this University has nearly prepared for publication, makes it superfluous for me to treat this subject otherwise than in broad outline.

Logically and in the order of thought the condition precedes the conditioned. While this is the order of the members of the conditional sentence in the majority of cases, Anglo-Saxon, like every flexible language, is free to adopt other arrangements of the clauses.

The possible relations of the subordinate to the independent clause, as concerns position, are three.

The conditional clause precedes.

This is the most usual arrangement. *Gif ic monnum cueme & licige, donne ne beo ic no Godes ðeow.* C. P. 147,20. *Drihten, gif þu wilt, þu miht me geclansian.* Hom. I, 120,11. The great majority of conds of class II with a command in the apod. have this order.

The conditional clause follows.

Only less common than the previous case. *ac wit on niht sculon secge ofersittan, gif he gesecean, dear wig ofer wæpen.* Beo 683. *þis bið ure rice, gif we hit nu*

geear-niað. Hom. I, 264,5. The buton clause usually follows its apod.

The conditional clause may stand between different members of the apodosis.

Swa eac treowa, gif bi beoðon fullum monan geheawene, hi beoð heardran. Hom. I, 102,22. swa þonne seo saul, gif heo ne bið mid Godes worde feded, gastlice hungre & þurste he bið cwelmed. Blick 57,11. Ne nan man ne mot, gif he Cristes miltse habban wile, his ælmessan behatan to wylle ne to wydetreowe. Wulf. 303,16. (deofol) — — wile oferstælan þone engel, gif he mæg, mid þæm yfelum weorcum. Wulf 233,9. þy he na mæg na wandian, gif he riht deþ, naþor ne for heaunum ne for ricum. Wulf. 275,20. cf. 305,21. be þæm þu miht sweotole ongitan, gif þu ænigne mon gesihst willnian þæs he næfþ, þæt þam biþ anweald wana. Cons. cp. 36, § 3, 176 h.

This interposition of the prot. is rare except with parenthetical, conditional formulas like gif he mæg cited above, or when a conjunction properly belonging to the apodosis is separated from it by the protasis (notably forðæm).

ORDER WITHIN THE PROTASIS.

The protasis introduced by gif has frequently the direct order. Subject — copula — complement, when it precedes the apodosis.

Gif ðonne ægder bið unwis, ðonne is to ge dencanne hwæt Crisd self cuæð on his Godspelle. C. P. 29,6. Gif we willaþ areccan ealle ða gewitnysse þe be Criste awritene sind, þonne gæd þær swiðe micel hwil to. Hom. II, 18,10. Gif þu sie Godes Sunu, cweþ þæt þa stanas to hlafum geweorþan. Blick 27,5.

When the complement is formed by an infinitive with an object or modifiers, the infinitive is often put at the end of the sentence, and its object or modifiers stand between the copula and the complementary infinitive.

Gif se sacerd ne mæg ðam læwedum mannum larspel secgan, huru he sceal þurh his lifes unscæddignysse, him wel bysnian. Hom. II, 532,16. And gif ge nellad þissum gewritum geleafan, ic sende ofer eow wyrmas and fuhlas wedende. Wulf. 231,11.

The direct order is not excluded but extremely rare when the protasis follows the apodosis.

Ac we sceolon awendan urne lec fram yfelre gesihðe, urne hlyst fram yfelre spræce — — gif we willað becuman to ðam estum þæs ecan gereordes. Hom. II, 374,3. We beoð soðlice gesceode, gif we geefenlæcad mid urnm færelde — — forðfarena manna lif. Hom. II, 280,30. Forþam ælc cræft 7 ælc anweald biþ sona forealdod 7 forswugod, gif he biþ butan wisdomes. Cons. cp. 17,60 m.

The Transposed order. subj. — complement — copula, is common when the protasis precedes and all but universal when the protasis follows the apodosis.

The protasis precedes the apodosis.

Gif mon hine (jet) on fyr deþ, þonne fleoþ þær neddran onweg. Beda 26,16. Gif ge þæt secan nyllaþ, þonne magon ge þær eardungstowe hæbban. Beda 28,14. Gif we hit forsuwian dorston, ne sæde we hit eow. Hom. II, 324,23. gif þu strang sy, syle wæstmas þinre eorðan. Wulf. 260,6. Gif hwa dearfian forsihd, hn tæld his Scyppend. Hom. II, 328,17.

The transposed is the usual order for an unfulfilled protasis.

Ac þær hi ænige wuht agnes odde gecyndelices godes on heora hæfdon, þonne hæfdon hi þæt mid him, þeah he þæt rice forleten. Cons. cp. 27, § 3, 100 h.

The protasis follows the apodosis.

ne biþ se cwuca ðonne nyttra þe se deada, gif him his yfel ne hreowþ. Cons. cp. 36, § 6, 182 m. Swa deð min se heofonlice Fæder, gif ge of eowrum heortum eowrum broðrum ne forgyfað. Mat. 18, 32. Ge beoð mine frynd, gif ge ða þing doð þe ic eow bebeode. Hom. II, 522, 28. ne hrepa ðu þæs treowes wæstm, forþan ðe þu bist deadlic, gif þu þæs treowes wæstm geetst. Hom. I, 14, 1.

Relative and Temporal conds. usually have the transposed order, though the direct order is not excluded.

The protasis introduced by buton (nemne, nymðe) is found both in the direct and in the transposed order. I am unable to state the principles which lies behind these changes except so far as they are covered by the rule given below. Two sentences like these from the same page show that the order is not a rigid one. Ac hwæðere nan man ne cymð to Godes rice, buton he sy afandod. Hom. I, 268, 8. compare ac hwæðere se man næfð na micle gedincðe, buton he afandod sy. Hom. I, 268, 18.

Direct order.

7 him ne forgyfð þætte he mote in Godes hus gongan, nemne he sy wætre adwegen. Beda 84, 25. forðan ðe nan man ue mæg habban Godes rice, buton he hæbbe ðas dreoðing. Hom. I, 250, 13. buton hwa beo ge-edcenned of wætere 7 of haligum gaste, ne mæg he infaran on godes rice. Jn. 3, 5.

Transposed order.

Se de to me cymd, ne mæg he beon min leorning-cniht buton he his wif hatige. Hom. I, 308,31. ne biþ hit no dy braþor swa, deah hi his wilnigen, buton hi þa fif ealle habban. Cons. cp. 38, § 2, 1241. Buton Drihten da burh gehealde, on ydel waciad þa hyrdas de hi healdad. Hom. II, 230,4.

For rhetorical emphasis the object may be thrown forward the clause remaining otherwise unchanged.

Þisses ic me ondræde swyde to gebidanne, buton me godes gife gemiltsige. Wulf. 248,13. Ia hwæt is se man on life, buton hine god ælmihtig gehealde — ? Wulf. 101,19.

Inversion: copula — subject — complement has already been noted as a method of forming a protasis without a conditional conjunction. Two citations will suffice to recall the case.

Næron hi gegaderode 7 geradode, swa wiperwearda gesceafta, ðonne ne wurdon he næfre ne geworhte ne ear gegaderode, and gif he hi (158) ne bunde mid his unabidendlicum racentum, ðonne toslupan hi ealle, etc. Cons. cp. 35, § 2, 1561. The first condition is a not particular happy variation of; *Mundus hic ex tam diuersis contrariisque partibus in unam formam minime conuenisset, nisi unus esset qui tam diuersa coniungeret.* Eade mihte þes cwyde beon læwedum mannum bediglod, nære se gæstlice getacnung. Hom. I, 94,33.

Through the kindness of Mr. C. A. Smith I am able to state a principle which lies behind and explains many of these changes from the direct sentence order. It is that the Anglo-Saxon has a constant tendency to place a pronominal object before its verb. Consequently all clauses with pronominal objects tend to fall out of the direct order, and most of them into the transposed order.

ORDER WITHIN THE APODOSIS.

The apodosis has the inverted order copula — subject — complement when *ne* or *þonne* stand — at the head of the clause, when the verb is imperative or subj. (adhortative), or when the complement is thrown forward for rhetorical emphasis.

The most frequent cases are:

With *þonne* as a correlative, far the most frequent form. *Ac gif he donne ðære styringe ne wiðstent, donne gescient he ða godan weorc ðe he oft ær on stillum mod ðurhteah.* C. P. 215,15. *donne bið he idel, gif he on ðæm sumra biðt ingonges in heofonrice.* C. P. 285,15. *Gif ðu ðas word mid weorcum gefylst, ðonne do ic swa ðu me tihst.* Hom. I, 422,16. *Gif ðu þis nelt, ðonne scealt ðu -- — mislice wita dro-wian.* Hom. I, 544,3.

Ne stands at the head of the clause. *Ne cwæde he no sna, gif he no on geate ðæt him wæs ðæs wana,* etc. C. P. 311,19. *ne cymþ he næfre to oferrum? ende, buton he hæbbe swa scearp and get swa þæt fyr.* Cons. cp. 39, § 4, p. 216 e. *Gif hi forseod Moyses æ and ðære witegena bodunga, nellad hi gelyfan, þeah hwa of deaðe arise.* Hom. I, 334,20.

The frequent use of correlative *þonne*, and of *ne* at the head of the apodosis of unfulfilled and *buton* conditions, makes the inverted apodosis by far the most common. The direct order is of course frequently admitted, the transposed seldom unless the apodosis is itself a subordinate clause.

REMARKS.

Imperative and adhortative clauses with the subject expressed usually have the inverted order. *Gif he Godes man sy, fylgað ge him* Beda 100,23. The direct order is also found in mandatory clauses. It

is very rare except in Aelfric. Gif hwa synful sy, he andette, and nælæs herige. Hom. I, 448,4; also 124,34; 584,1. Þu leofa butan me, gif þu mæge. Wulf 259,5. This is simply another version of: leofa, gif ðu maga, buton me. Hom. II, 104,6.

2. Two examples which show very well that inversion depends upon the presence of adverbial elements at the head of the clause are: Ac gif hc gelyfdon þone Hælend, þonne sitt he wið þone weig. Gif he nele biddan þæs ecan leohtes, he sit ðonne blind he ðam wege unbiddende. Hom. I, 156,2. These sentences exemplify very well the conditions under which þonne produces the inverted or admits the direct order. So with both ne and ðonne: Gif he abryð on ðære ehtnyssse, hi ne bið ðonne geleafa, ac bið hiwung. Hom. I, 250,20.

3. A rhetorical throwing forward of a portion of the complement causes inversion of the rest of the clause. Gif se Halga Gast ne lærd þæs mannes mod wið innan, on idel beoð þæs bydeles word wiðutan geclypode. Hom. I, 320,25. The same rhetorical tendency is shown by the following example, though the adhortative clause would probably in any event have the inverted order. and ealswa Niniuete, gif man þæt geræde, gold and glencga aleege man þa hwile. Wulf 170,7. The rule is not rigid as is shown by the following example of a infrequent word order. Gif ðu Gode soðe dædbote geoffrast, his soðan miltsunge þu begytst. Hom. II, 418,11.

IX.

PECULIARITIES OF THE DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS AND CONDITIONAL CONJUNCTIONS.

It is obvious that the conditional construction perhaps more than any other is affected with regard to its frequency and variety, by the nature of a document or the character of the Latin original upon which it is based. Thus we are prepared to find that Orosius shows very few conditions since it is a straight-forward paraphrase of a historical narrative. So we find it natural that the annalistic style of the Chronicle should use few conditions, and these mostly in the historical or preterite tense. The abundance of anecdote in Bede is sufficient cause for the prevalence of indirect discourse in that text. On the other hand the homiletic style with its continual arguments *ad hominem*, and warnings and illustrations shows comparatively little indirect discourse and an abundance of conditions most of them in present time.

The Alfredian Boethius and the Homilies of Aelfric are unequalled in the richness and diversity of form which they give to this construction. The 'ideal' condition shows a much wider scope; and the clause and word order is somewhat freer than in the other texts. There is certainly more feeling for style in these texts than in the Cura

Pastoralis which is a simple, idiomatic rendering, and the Beda which is a some what slavish translation, of its original.

With respect to this construction the Gospels follow the Latin more slavishly than any other text. They follow the moods of the original and even the word order as closely as possible. The feeling of reverence for the letter of the scriptures which affects all translations from them is perfectly natural and evident. A single instance will illustrate the difference between the Gospels and other texts. The following passage has the indic. following the Latin, three times in the Gospels: and *gyf hwa to inc hwæt cwyð* (*dixent*), *secgað þæt drihten hæfd his neode 7 he hine sona hider læt* Mk. 11,3; *cwyð* (*dixerit*) mt. 21,3; *ahsad* (*interrogauit*) Lk. 19,31. An independent rendering shows the subj. in protasis, the proper form with a mandatory apodosis: & *gif inc* (71) *hwa þæs wiþcwepe, secgaþ þæt Drihten þæs ah þearfe, raþe hie mon þonne forlæteþ to me.* Blick 71,1.

The Aelfredian texts, poetry (though the material is small) and the Blickling Homilies seldom admit an indic. in the protasis of Class II, Aelfric, quite exceptionally for a text presumably free from Latinizing tendency, uses many indic. in this case. The miscellaneous collection of Wulfstan's Homilies, shows again almost exclusively subjs.

Rushworth Matthew shows a very interesting difference from all the other texts in the fact that conditional *þær* and *nu*, which are only sporadic elsewhere, are regular conditional conjunctions in it.

nu nuþonne 6,30; *nu* 10,25, *nunu* 22,45.

þær 11,19; 12,7; 23,30; 24,22; 24,24; 24,43.

The theory suggests itself that these may have been forms rather colloquial than literary. The fact that they

creep in a few times only in each document, and their use by the undoubtedly provincial scribe of Rushworth Matthew, give a little support to this view.

nymde, nemne for buton.

In another connection I may call attention to the dialectical significance of nemne, nymde. And may suggest that they are certainly Anglian and probably Mercian. Alfred, excluding Beda, Aelfric and Wulfstan do not use the form. It is represented in West-Saxon only by three instances in the Blickling Homilies and three in glossaries, and a few in the Paris Psalter.

Beda gives nemne the preference over buton. This and the fact that Beda prefers *swa swa* for *swylce* in the sense of 'as if' are only a foretaste of the many syntactical differences that Dr. Miller will be able to adduce against the Alfredian authorship of Beda.

The Vespasian Psalter and Hymns and Rushworth Matthew prefer nemne and nymde. The forms are also found in the Lindesfarne Gospels, under the influence of the Rushworth gloss.

Nemne, nymde is found beside buton throughout the whole body of the poetry, though not in the songs from the Chronicle and the Battle of Maldon which are undoubtedly West-Saxon. Beowulf and the Cædmon cycle show it abundantly; it is found in the Riddles, and in the poems of the Cynewulf cycle.

It is hard to see any considerable progress or development of the conditional construction during Anglo-Saxon times. Aelfric and Wulfstan show certainly an advance over the Pastoral Care and the Blickling homilies; but Boethius shows already all the forms and varieties of the later texts. There was undoubtedly some advance toward the use of

auxiliaries and compound tenses, but no very marked one.

The extension of the -st ending to the pret, opt 2nd sing. in weak verbs and the consequent levelling out of the distinction between moods of the pret. of weak verbs is the only change of note that I have been able to discover.

CONDITIONAL CONJUNCTIONS AND CORRELATIVES.

This matter will have been so thoroughly exhibited in the examples, that a brief and dogmatic recapitulation will suffice at this point. For exceptional forms the reader is referred to section V.

The regular conditional conjunction is gif. The form gief is rarely found; in Late West-Saxon gyf is common. Gef is occasionally instanced, especially in Wulfstan (Napier) homily 44, a text which seems to show a transitional vocalism with strong Kentish features.

þær is established as an occasional conjunction for the unfulfilled condition, and Rushworth Matthew makes nu a regular conditional conjunction.

Buton (butan, in L.W.S. bute, North. bnta) also nefne, nemne (nymne) and nymde (nemde) introduce the protasis of Class V.

þonne appears probably in rather over half the apodoses as a correlative to gif or buton. It is frequently found in both protasis and apodosis, in which case it could have had little more than the force of a particle, with the slightest temporal significance.

STATISTICAL APPENDIX.

The purpose of this portion of the work is to make sufficient material accessible, to check readily the statements made in the text, or to command the field for purposes of further study. It is no aim of the writer to present all the material which he has collected. In view of the inevitable suspicion which must fall upon selected statistics, the writer has decided to give the complete material for the Pastoral Care, the Orosius, and the Homilies of Aelfric, thus giving control of the most important monuments of Early, and of Late West-Saxon respectively.

The material from other texts, complete in each instance, is offered where it has particular value or interest. It seemed necessary only with Classes II and III to support the classification by examples so far as possible from the whole Anglo-Saxon field.

Statistics which have been made complete in the text are not repeated here. Such are: the pres. subs. not included under classes II and V which have been treated in Section IV appendix to class III; and conditions in indirect discourse etc. for which the material from the Pastoral Care, Orosius, and the Homilies of Aelfric has been made complete in Section VII, also most of the matters treated in small type.

In general matters merely accessory to the construction and treated somewhat minutely in the Sections from V inclusive have not been repeated.

It is hoped that the large body of material from Aelfric's *Homilies*, by all means the most important monument of Anglo-Saxon syntax and prose style, will be particularly acceptable.

CLASS I. SIMPLE CONDITION.

A. WITH THE PRES. INDIC. IN BOTH CLAUSES.

Pastoral Care.

& ge dón, swæ we swide eade magon, mid Godes fultume, gif we ða stilnesse habbad, ðæt[te] eall sio giogud — — — sien to liornunga odfæste. 79, 296,7, 3225, 331, 3512, 4510,12,20, 4710,13, 491, 5313, 633, 6917,20,22, 718,15,19, 7914,23, 818, 8319, 9310,18, 977,9, 1114, 1156, 12315,17, 12520, 1297, 1331, 1375,13, 14720, 15715, 16713, 17125, 1933, 1979, 20114, 21114,20, 21515, 21714, 2201, 2221,12, 22522, 22922, 2311, 23310, 2651, 2713, 27317, 2778, 2812, 28323, 28515, 29512, 3031, 30720, 3277, 33313,20, 33511, 3419,11,17, 35114, 36110, 36724, 37717, 38331, 38532, 3976, 40725,29, 41114, 4212,5, 42332,35, 4256,8, 4331,27, 43721, 4419,17, 4458,21,28, 44710,19, 44912, 45124, 45925, 4695.

Orosius: 7 gyf þar man án ban finded unforbærned, he hit sceolan miclum gebetan 2112, 6414, 1207, 15631, 2147.

Homilies of Aelfric.

Vol. I. Gehwá mæg þe eadelicor ða toweardan costunge acuman, ðurh Godes fultum, gif hé bið ðurh boclice lare getrymned. 43,7, 624,27, 141,12, 1614, 182, 5227,29,33,34, 541,24, 563,17, 7028, 7217,31, 8633, 965,7,26,33, 981, 10222, 1103, 11422,23,

118_{5,11,18}, 120_{11,29}, 124₂, 138₁₂, 140_{29,33}, 142_{13,15}, 148₁₂,
 156_{2,25,28}, 160₁₁, 162₃₁, 164₉, 166₂₄, 168₂₉, 170₁₅, 176₂₀,
 178₂₁, 204_{7,10,23}, 210₃₅, 212₁₇, 222₂, 224₁₂, 232_{33,35}, 234₁₂,
 238₁₇, 240_{10,13}, 248₃₁, 250_{11,20}, 252₂₈, 254₉, 256_{15,22}, 260_{2,7},
 264₅, 266_{3,26,31}, 268₁₉, 272_{32,34}, 274₈, 276₇, 286_{24,26}, 306_{1,9,10},
 312₃₃, 320₂₅, 334₂₀, 338₂₃, 340₁₇, 350₉, 372₁₅, 378₁₂, 390₁₀,
 408₁₈, 410_{3,28}, 412_{3,6,26,34}, 416₁₈, 420_{2,32}, 422_{13,16}, 428₂₈, 438₂₆,
 456₂₉, 460_{22,34}, 464₁₅, 468₂₁, 472_{2,6,16}, 480₂₂, 488₃₂, 494₈,
 496_{22,30}, 498_{18,24}, 506₂₅, 528₂₀, 556_{25,27}, 562₂₃, 570₂₅, 574_{31,32,34},
 576₁₀, 586_{10,19}, 588₃₅, 590_{2,6,26}, 592₂₈, 594_{3,18,21}, 598₃.

Vol. II: 12_{8,13}, 18₁₀, 22₂₇, 28₉, 30₁₀, 50₃, 60₁, 62₃₀,
 64₂₇, 66₂₅, 74₁₃, 76₁₀, 102_{5,15,18,21,30}, 104₇, 106₁₇, 138₂₀, 170₆,
 174₁₃, 186₆, 200₄, 208_{6,10,31}, 210_{27,29}, 216₂₀, 218_{9,16,27}, 222₉,
 224₈, 228₃, 230₁₇, 234₁₂, 240₂₉, 266₁, 270_{6,9}, 278₃, 280_{21,30},
 282₂₂, 308₁₇, 314_{14,28,29}, 316_{7,16,33}, 318₁₃, 320₁₄, 322₁₁, 324_{1,5},
 328_{16,17,27}, 330₂₁, 354₄, 356_{12,14}, 362_{1,33}, 374₃, 390₃₁, 392₂₅,
 394_{2,10}, 396_{1,27}, 406₂₆, 408₇, 410_{8,24,27}, 418₁₁, 430_{4,6,12}, 436₂₁,
 442₂₅, 444_{17,30}, 464₃₀, 466₆, 470₁, 516₂₆, 522_{8,28}, 528_{3,11,19},
 532_{3,11,13,16}, 534_{3,13,22,26}, 536₁₀, 544₃₅, 554₂₀, 562₂₉, 564₆, 574₁₄,
 576₂₅, 582₂₄, 588_{28,30}, 590₂₉, 592_{10,21}, 602_{11,16,19}.

Apodosis is a question or exclamation.

Pastoral Care. 59₂₄, 63_{1,5}, 91₂₄, 133₃, 281₁₃, 333_{8,10},
 341₄, 371₁₆, 377_{3,8}, 405₁₁, 421₁₉.

Homilies of Aelfric, Vol. I: 26₁₇, 68₂₃, 250_{7,8}, 252₂₁,
 256₅, 302₃₄, 396₂. Vol. II: 226_{5,13}, 268₂₁, 328₅, 368₁₁, 408₃₄,
 420₁₃, 430₁₇, 432_{2,14}, 462₂₅, 536₁₃, 582₁₁.

B. PRET. INDIC. IN PROTASIS, PRET. INDIC. OR PRES. INDIC. IN
 APODOSIS.

Pastoral Care.

Pret. indic. in both clauses: 53₈, 253₇, 389₃₁. Verb
 of the apod. is pres. indic.: Gif Crist for us eallum dead

was, ðonne weorðad ealle men deade. 43⁹, 57^{14,23}, 217⁷, 401³⁴.

Beda. Pret. indic. in both clauses. 162^{4,12}. Pres. indic. in apod. 2¹¹, 88^{19,22}, 102¹⁸)

Homilies of Aelfric.

Pret. indic. in both clauses.

Vol. I: gif he hwon hnáppode, ðærrihte hine drehton nihtlice gedwimor. 86¹⁷, 124⁸, 176³³, 332^{1,6}, 404³, 534³, 560¹⁰. Vol. II: 130³, 140^{7,17}, 180¹³, 242¹⁸, 392¹⁰, 514¹⁴.

Pres. indic. in apod. Vol. I: 54²⁶, 112¹⁹, 268²⁹, 442⁶, 556². Vol. II: 80¹⁸, 284²⁶, 418²⁴, 452³², 476²¹.

CLASS II. THE CONDITION WITH A MANDATORY APODOSIS.

THE VERB OF THE PROTASIS IS PRES. SUBJ.

Pastoral Care. 43^{4,12,13,15}, 127¹ (*est*), 131⁶, 159⁹, 197⁵, 323⁴ (*ministrat*), 347²² (*habetis*), 349⁹ (*offers*), 357² (*expellitur*), 4 (*obedit*), 371¹⁵ (*loquitur*) 383¹ (*est*), 437⁹ (*dispiciunt*), 457²⁶ (*ris*), 45² (*is cynn*), 199¹³ (*sceal*), 22 (*is dearf*) 367²² (*sculon*).

Orosius. gif his hwa sie lustfull mare to witanne, sece him þonne self þæt 100²⁵, 214^{10,13}.

Boethius. 14^h (*vis*), 18^h (*perhorrescis*), 36^h, 120^l, 198^l, 232^l *ris*.

Beda. 36¹⁶ (*est*), 22 (*vis*), 72²⁴ (*contingat*), 26 (*est*), 100²³ (*est*), 33, 102², 278¹⁸, 280³, 400⁶ (*vultis*).

Inflected infinitive: *is cynn* 45², 72⁵, 74¹. *Sceal*: 86¹⁶. *Weorde is* 136⁷. *ic bidðo*: 6¹, 290^{21,23}.

Beowulf: 45², sec, gif þu dyrre 1379. 1480. Genesis: 231¹, 249⁸, 265⁵, 282⁵. Satan: 68⁶. Andreas 41⁷, 55⁷. Elene: 54⁰, 62⁰, 72² (apod. 78³); 85⁶.

Riddles: 33¹³, 40²⁸.

Oldest English Texts (Charters): No. 34 ll. 11, 12, 19, No. 38 ll. 7, 9, No. 41 ll. 14, 24, 40, No. 45 ll. 12, 15, 16, 25, 26. The apodosis is a command less vividly expressed. *is min willa* 41_{4,7}, *we bebeodað* 48₁₇, *ann ic* (I grant) 41₃₅, 45₄₅.

Gospels.

Matthew: 4₃, 5_{29,20,39}, 16₂₄, 26_{39,42}, 27_{40,42,43}, 26₆₃ (*ic halsige*).

Mark 3₂₃, 7₁₆.

Luke 4_{3,9} 22₆₇, 23_{35,37}.

John 12₂₆.

Blickling Homilies. 27_{5,10}, 29₂₅, 43₉, 71₁, 109₁₈, 153₁₉, 177₁, 179₂₅, 181₁₄, 183_{16,17}, 225₂₅, 233_{18,34}, 241₂₀, 243₁₈.

Apod. with sceal etc.: 47_{25,30}, 49₂, 205_{23,25}.

Homilies of Aelfric. Vol. I: *ac gif he wille þæt him God milde sý, þonne hlyste hé gódes rædes.* 54₁₇, 56₁₇, 96₁, 132₂₇, 148₄, 166_{12,17}, 168₂₁, 170_{1,18}, 180₁₀, 226₈, 242₂₂, 268₂₀, 372₁₃, 376₂₅, 416₂₃, 424₃, 448₄, 450₁₈, 460₁₁, 464₂₂, 480₇, 506₂₈, 516₄, 584₁, 590₁₉.

Vol. II: 48₃₄, 104_{2,6}, 174₁₇, 184₁₁, 216₂₄, 256_{5,10}, 264₇, 280₈, 290_{30,31}, 388₂₈, 392₂₈, 488₁₈, 594₁₇.

Apod. with sceal etc. Vol. I: 8₉ (*bidde' ic*), 156₂₁; 482₂₆ (*bid us rædlicor*) Aelfric's Translation of the Heptateuch and of Job. (from Wohlfahrt) Gen. 15₅, 18₃, 19₁₂, 32₁₇, 47₆. Ex. 12_{4,10}, 21_{3,4}, 22_{4,6,7,9,12,26}, 23_{4,5}, 29₃₄. Lev. 11₀, 37₁₂, 20₂, 24₁₉, 25₂₅. Num. 31₀, 13₁. Dent. 14₂₄, 15₇, 21₁₈, 22₂₂, 23_{24,25}.

Since the homilies ascribed to Wulfstan are to a considerable extent a repetition of texts already treated, it has not seemed necessary to offer statistics from them. Suffice it to say that like the early texts they show almost without exception the subj. in protasis in this case.

The indie. in protasis (apodosis a command).

Pastoral Care. 103₉ (*dubitant*), 199₉, 403₂. 407₁₅ (is cyn).
Beda 64₂₅, 130₄.

Boethius cp. 7, p. 26 h; cp. 13, p. 38 h; cp. 33, § 1,
p. 120 l.

Chron. E 33₂₃.

Gospels.

Matthew: 4₆, 5₂₃, 3₃₁, 14₂₈, 17₄, 18_{8,9,15,16,17}, 19_{7,21} 21₃.
24_{23,26}. Mark.: 8₃₄, 9_{7,22,35,13,15}, 11_{3,25}, 13₂₁. Luke: 9₂₃, 10₆,
15₉, 17_{3,4} 19₃₁, 22₁₂. 23₃₉. John.: 7₄, 8₃₉, 10_{37,38}. 14₁₅. 15₇,
18_{8,23}.

In practically all of these instances the verb of the Latin
condition is indic.

Homilies of Aelfric. Vol. I: 54₁₉, 62₇, 124₃₁, 420₆,
464₁₃, 512₃₀, 556₁. Vol. II: 88_{29,30}, 104₁, 246₂₁, 276₁₇. 294₃,
318₁₂, 328₂₄, 392₃₄, 400₅, 414₁₃, 484₃₁, 486₆, 534_{8,11}, 592_{30,34}.

Apod. sceal etc. Vol. I: 140₁₃, 162₂₇, 174₃₃, 274_{10,12},
516_{9,14}, 554_{5,7}. Vol. II: 22₄, 202₈, 544₂₇.

Aelfric's Heptateuch and Job.

Introduction 14₃₀. Ex. 21₂₂, 22_{7,8}. Lev. 1₁₄, 4₂₂, 7_{17,25},
20₉. 25₂₀. Num. 14₁₃. Deut. 19₁₈, 25₃. Jud. 15₉. Job 8₂.

CLASS III. IDEAL CONDITION.

Boethius. Cp. 13, p. 38 m; cp. 14, § 3, p. 46 l; cp. 16,
§ 2, p. 52 h; cp. 27, § 2, p. 96 l (2 conds); cp. 32, § 2,
p. 116 m; cp. 33, § 1, p. 120 l; cp. 34, § 4, p. 138 m; cp. 35,
§ 4, p. 160 l; cp. 36, § 2, p. 174 h; cp. 38, § 6, p. 208 m;
cp. 41, § 2, p. 244 l. Inverted protasis, cp. 27, § 3, p. 98 l.
Caed. Gen. 407, 831. Andreas 478. John 21,25 (scribantur)
Blick 247₁.

Homilies of Aelfric. Vol. I: 40₂₇, 112₅, 212₂₅, Vol. II:
88₁₇, 454₂₂. Job. 12₆. Introduction to Old and New Test. 15,42.

CLASS IV. UNFULFILLED CONDITION.

Pastoral Care. 187₂, 217₂₁, 235₂, 255₁₉, 265₃, 303₂, 309₂, 311_{19,23}, 313₃, 331₈, 359₁, 385₃₄, 391₃₂, 427₂₉, 435_{1,3}. Orosius. 104₃, 186₂₃, 218₅.

Homilies of Aelfric. Vol. I: 4₅, 12₁₂, 18₂₃, 26₂₆, 52₁, 82₂₈, 94₃₃, 124_{7,18}, 130₅, 142₂₆, 146₁₄, 150₇, 164₁₆, 170₂₁, 174₂₀, 184₁₉ (buton), 214₃₂, 220_{8,18}, 224₁₉, 226₁₀, 236₂₇, 248₃₄, 276₁₈, 292₁, 320₁, 328₂₄, 330₉, 332₃₄ (buton), 336₂₃, 404_{27,33}, 408₇, 484_{28,29}, 578_{1,11,12}, 590₄. Vol. II: 6₂₇, 40₂₉ (buton), 80₂₆, 106₄, 144₁₃, 192₂₃, 156₂₂, 234₁₀, 248₃, 300₂₇, 320₂, 324₂₃, 344₂₆, 358₁₅, 380₄, 412₁₀, 574₇.

CLASS V. THE CONDITION WITH BUTON.

A. PURELY EXCEPTIVE.

Pastoral Care. 43₆, 169₆, 191₇, 222₁₄, 349₁₆, 445₁₄.

Homilies of Aelfric. Vol. I: 8₁₂, 14₆, 164₅, 260₂₄, 464₁, 590₁₁. Vol. II: 22₂, 224₂₄, 230₄, 324₇, 336₂₁, 340₂₃, 416₃₄, 422₂₁, 462₂₂, 528₂₈, 592₂₃.

B. INDISPENSABLE CONDITION.

Pastoral Care. 157₁₇, 163₁₉, 207₁, 217₃, 251₁₄, 345₁₉, 441₇, 445₁₀. Orosius. 58₁₃.

Homilies of Aelfric. Vol. I: 14₄, 16₂₃, 26₂₉, 94_{10,30}, 122₁₉, 128₃₂, 144₃₃, 148₃₁, 170_{12,14}, 186_{6,10}, 222₁₂, 250₁₃, 254₂₀, 266₁₂, 268_{8,18}, 280₄, 308_{31,35}, 412₃₂, 462₂₂, 474₂₉, 512₁₉, 598₁₄. Vol. II: 10_{32,35}, 12₂, 74₁₅, 100₂₇, 210₂₆, 222₁₃, 266₂₅, 314₁₇, 318₂₆, 320₂₀, 322₂₁, 336_{22,29}, 340₁₂, 402₃, 432₉, 470₂₂, 582₁₂, 592₂₈, 602₈, 604_{6,12}.

